

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Oxford Group has many critics. That is to be expected. For it has life, and life is a ferment. Jesus warned us that new wine cannot be put into old wineskins without doing damage. That is a parable to be kept in mind when we are up in arms against anything that threatens established conventions, especially in religion. It may be said in defence of some of the criticism, that the Group has not been well served by its literary interpreters, with one or two notable exceptions. A good many might revise their judgments if Canon Streeter or Professor Emil Brunner would take this task in hand.

The latest addition to Group literature is *Life began Yesterday*, by Mr. Stephen Foot (Heinemann; 5s. net). It will not be surprising if this book meets with some rough handling, for Mr. Foot seems to write as if the Oxford Group form of Christianity were the only real form of it that had ever existed since the days of the New Testament Church. But this kind of limitation has always accompanied any form of religious revival. The merit of the book is that it does fix our minds on the world's primary need, which is the conversion of men and women, both inside and outside the churches, to vital Christianity. The new world begins in new people. It is what it is because of what we are. Therefore the world's condition challenges our individual lives.

stood, by both Groupers and others, exactly what the movement is. It does not aim at producing a new theology. It does not seek to form a new sect with a peculiar life of its own. It is an evangelistic movement. Its aim is to bring men and women into vital touch with God. Most people can give a diagnosis of the ills from which we suffer to-day. Thousands instructed in the churches believe that in Christ alone we can find the solution for the world's problems and the power for its spiritual life. But where most people fail is to demonstrate just how the solutions of Christ can be practically applied to the individual situation, and just how His power, which at the moment is only static, can become dynamic in the life of the individual. That is the unsolved problem which is frustrating the efforts of thousands of people both in the pulpit and in the pew. It is just there that the Oxford Group has found its sphere. And that may be the reason why its published literature is not better than it is. Volumes that are rich and satisfying to heart and intelligence can be written about religion. But books about how conversion happens have a narrower field.

Mr. Foot's story of his own conversion is not very dramatic. It was a change of motive, which is all conversion is, though that is everything. 'The little more and how much it is.' It meant doing the old things from a new centre. He follows this by chapters showing how the new spirit works in business, politics, education, the home, etc.

The poorest chapter, curiously enough, is that on Education, which is his own subject. The illustrations he gives could be paralleled by others in the lives of schoolmasters who never heard of the Oxford Group but have a reasonable understanding of psychology, a real religion and a good fund of common sense. In his chapter on Business he speaks of the Holy Spirit being Chairman of a commercial company. This language may be chosen to give point to his plea for the guiding of the Spirit. But it jars. It jars for the same reason that the phrase about 'dictatorship of the Holy Spirit' jars. Dictators are not attractive figures. Christ definitely refused, in His temptations, to take the position. God's method is not dictation; it is persuasion. That is why the Kingdom of God is so slow in coming. He refuses to force the will. He seeks to win its consent through awakening our insight into what is true and right. He draws us from a cross. He will not make a beautiful world at the cost of submerging our own insight and reason. A man may begin by surrendering to the compulsion of conscience in some direction or other. But till love has won his heart he is not saved. He is a bondslave, not a son. It is here perhaps that the Group outlook has been in need of amplification.

There are two points on which many people are critical. One of them is on the subject of guidance. On this point those who seek for light will find little in this book. We are only told that it comes through listening to God. Mr. Foot rightly suggests that some criticise this method because they are afraid of what guidance might ask. This is true, and the critics should ponder it. But there are others who fear it for another reason. They are afraid of the irrational. They suspect that what they may be induced to think the voice of God is only the suggestion of their subconscious minds. It may be a will o' the wisp. It may be a caprice, quite irrational and quite wrong. It is true that in other quarters it has been stressed that guidance comes through reason, through conference with others, through a conscience instructed in the Scriptures and conversant with all the facts of the situation—the mind working, of course, in the atmosphere of utter willingness to do the will of

God. This is not made clear in this book. And a good deal more thinking needs to be done about it. But the Groups have done us this service—that they have brought into light the absolute necessity of being willing to do the will of God, and in that willingness of being ready to listen to God's voice. The supreme medium of the guiding of the Spirit is the mind of Christ. There is a difference between the quality of the guidance of the Spirit in the Old Testament and that in the New. That difference was made by the knowledge of Jesus Christ.

The other point of common criticism is sharing. It is no doubt true that this practice has its dangers. But here the Groups have done the Church a real service. A good deal can be said for the practice. It is a way of release, for one thing, to open the heart to the right person. It is good to tell some other our sins. It marks our willingness to be real about them and to come off the pedestal of reputation, which is often a refuge from reality. Sharing is the most effective means of helping people, because the most convincing way of making God real is by the story of personal experience. It is, moreover, a real part of fellowship in Christ. The Group has four standards. But, as Mr. Foot shows, the cardinal challenge is to honesty. This goes deeper than appears. Was not Christ's one demand the demand for sincerity? If a man is sincere, which just means honest, he will find God. All truth will be open to him. The chapter on the Home in this book reveals what honesty has achieved in the healing of unhappy homes. The most difficult barriers to get down are often those between parents and children, and sometimes between husbands and wives.

This book will help many people if they want to be helped. These will take what helps them and leave the rest, which is exactly what they do with any other book. For whatever the critical may say about some of the things to be found in it, one thing remains clear. All is not well with the Church. All is not well with the ministers. We need many things—a much bolder affirmation of the way of Christ in this mad world of fear and hostility. But this also we need—to know for ourselves the way to God and to help others to find it so that

Christ can become a life-changing Power. With all its weaknesses the Oxford Group has on this matter a word of God for our day. It will be tragic if the churches refuse to listen.

Few problems are more difficult and more persistently troublesome than that of the relation of Church and State. It sprang to the front as soon as the Church was born, and we are yet far from seeing a solution of it. 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's,' said our Lord, but that principle does not determine for us what things are Cæsar's and what are God's.

History has seen a variety of attempts to solve the problem. In the first Christian centuries Cæsar with his claim to divine honours plainly usurped the place of God, and the Church was forced into resistance even to the death. In the Middle Ages the Papacy claimed that Cæsar's authority was secondary and derivative, and must always be exercised in obedience to the dictates of the Church. This claim was naturally resisted by the State. At the Reformation in Protestant lands the State gained a very considerable degree of control, particularly in England where the King was the acknowledged head of the Church, and in the German states where the principle was adopted, 'Cujus regio, ejus religio.' In Scotland, where the battle was fought out with great tenacity and ability, the principle was maintained of 'co-ordinate jurisdiction with mutual subordination.' It was a fine sonorous phrase which aimed at holding the balance even between the spiritual and the temporal, but it gave no help in defining the boundaries of the two jurisdictions, and it was found in practice that they were inextricably intertwined. English Nonconformity in recent years has favoured the watchword, 'a free Church in a free State,' which rests on the dubious assumption that Church and State can each live its own life in single blessedness.

This age-long problem has once again come to

the front as one of the vital issues of the day. Since the War the spirit of nationalism has been greatly stimulated, and in forms which are frequently narrow and intolerant. There is consequently a prospect that Christian missions will be denied the freedom of action which they have hitherto generally enjoyed in the heathen lands of the East. Still more urgent has the problem become in Christian lands where the emergence of the totalitarian state, as in Russia, Italy, and Germany, threatens to absorb and control every activity of human life. The Church in these lands is either in danger of being exterminated or of being fettered and enslaved. 'The perilous condition of Continental Protestantism in relation to the Governments has led the *Universal Council for Life and Work*, the continuation of the Stockholm Conference of 1925, to decide that the special subject for study and consideration at the next Conference in 1937 shall be *Church, Community, and State*.'

In view of this Dr. A. E. GARVIE has issued a book on *The Fatherly Rule of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), in which he surveys the whole field in a masterly way and offers suggestions for a solution of the problem. It hardly needs to be said that there are few writers, if any, more competent to handle this most difficult subject than Dr. GARVIE. His grasp of Christian principle, his wide knowledge of Church history and comparative religion, his mastery in the fields of economics and sociology, together with his intimate acquaintance with the situation on the Continent both religious and political, give unusual weight to his views, and will doubtless secure for them the most careful consideration.

Dr. GARVIE realizes that the problem of Church and State is part of the wider problem of God's Fatherly rule of the world, and that it must be approached in the first instance through a consideration of God's relation to man as an individual. Emphasis must be laid on this, because the present danger is that the individual may be swallowed up by the community. This is a very grave and imminent danger indeed. A Russian cartoon

depicts 'communal man' as a gigantic figure striding over the heads of a vast crowd of pigmies dimly seen around his feet. But surely it should be evident that the value of the community is dependent on the value of the individuals composing it, and that, if personality be depreciated or stamped out, the community will be little better than a collection of robots.

At the same time the State is no artificial construction. It exists by a natural necessity because man is essentially a social personality. Rousseau's picture of man in the state of Nature as a solitary unit who afterwards had a social bond imposed upon him has no contact with reality. On the other hand, Dr. GARVIE demurs to the current way of speaking about society as an organism. He does not think that biological terminology adequately expresses the situation. The individual is something more than merely part of a social organism. Society does not absorb and control him as completely as the body controls its members. 'A society is a *willed* relation. A flock, or a herd, or a pack is not a society. Where men have common interests, or community, they will come together in an *association*, and that association will have common modes of action, which are its *institutions*.' 'What makes the Church a community is the common possession (*Koinonia*) of the Holy Spirit, the new life from God which results from faith in the love of God as realised in the grace of Christ. . . . As regards the State, the community is the common nationality, the sense of belonging to one nation.'

In these two communities Christian men are placed, and sharp conflicts of loyalty may arise, and have arisen. It is of immense importance that these should be averted, and the ideal is that the two communities should be 'perfected into one.' 'The Church so divided does not realise that unity, and its authority and influence in the world is less than it might be. Were the Spirit of God, through the Church, to pervade, purify, and perfect all social relations, then we might look for a human society on earth that reflected the glory of the one God.'

Dr. GARVIE finds that 'a slogan such as "A free Church in a free State," does not correspond to the actual situation; since Church and State are not separate departments of society closed the one to the other.' Especially is this the case in our time when the State has greatly extended its functions so as to include almost the whole range of human life. In this connexion Dr. GARVIE gives a very illuminating review of the situation in Germany where the claims of the totalitarian state are being vigorously pressed. Under such conditions the Church cannot be free if she would. At the same time the Church also must be, in her own way, totalitarian. She cannot be indifferent to any human interest. Her mission is to save 'the whole manhood of all mankind,' and in carrying out this mission she finds that man's material and spiritual interests are so joined together that they can in no wise be put asunder.

It follows that some concordat must be sought which will permit of friendly co-operation between Church and State. Here is a field which bristles with practical difficulties such as will test the finest statecraft and churchmanship. Dr. GARVIE has a wealth of practical suggestions to offer on the duties of Christian citizenship and the claims of public service on Christians, the responsibility of the Church as God's interpreter, and the duty of making herself 'competent by adequate knowledge of all the relevant facts to offer sound judgment.' 'This co-operation with the State to be fully Christian must be tolerant, considerate, courteous. The Church should fully recognise the difficulties which confront, the dangers which threaten, the responsibilities which rest upon the State. It must not offer sentimental advice about the treatment of criminals, which would weaken the authority of the State in restraining crime. It must not urge extreme measures of disarmament which would prevent the State's exercising the international influence which its position and resources allow it, or fulfilling the pledges which it has made to other nations. It must not ask for economic changes which would jeopardise the common interests of all classes of society.'

Dr. GARVIE is particularly interesting in his discussion of problems of conscience where it comes into conflict with Law. His views are clear-cut and stimulating to a degree. He no longer defends passive resistance to the Education Act. 'In view of the orgies of lawlessness witnessed in many parts of the world, I now judge that even what I then did was wrong; the injustice involved was not great enough to justify even that very mild defiance of law.' He holds that the Conservative party brought moral disgrace upon itself by fomenting sedition in Ulster, that the Labour party discredited itself by the sanction it gave to the General Strike, that the Black-and-Tan policy was a moral iniquity, and that resistance to the enforcement of the law of Tithes cannot claim sympathy as an expression of the Nonconformist conscience. He has equally suggestive observations on problems of the family and education, industry and military service, with special reference to pacifism and the conscientious objector.

The last chapter deals with the problems which arise in connexion with internationalism and the universalism or 'œcumenicity' of the Church. 'The universalism of Christianity cannot be confined to the relation of the Churches: it must be extended to the relation of the nations to one another. . . . This Christian internationalism will not command the authority among the nations it needs, as long as the world hears only the confused voices of a multitude of Churches, instead of the voice of the one Church. For that one voice we need not wait till all ecclesiastical organizations are brought together; but all Christians whom the spirit of œcumenicity unites can bear a common testimony and wield a common influence.'

A layman asked Dr. R. E. ROBERTS recently, 'Why don't the parsons tell us what they believe instead of telling us what they think it is good for us to believe?' The question probably expresses what people sometimes feel as a defect in preaching, the absence of a personal note, an element of witness or moving conviction which, when modest

and guarded, is the most persuasive of all spiritual influences. But, apart from that, the question is worth answering; and, as readers know, the editors of this journal have persuaded some eminent men to put down their personal creed with some fulness.

Was it this fact that suggested to the publishers of the 'God and Life' Series the symposium, *What I Believe*, which has just appeared? It is edited by Mr. B. Aquila Barber (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), and contains the contributions of some forty-two persons, most of them 'parsons.' The list includes, Dr. J. Alexander FINDLAY, Dr. George JACKSON, Dr. R. E. ROBERTS, Dr. Donald O. SOPER, and Dr. Ryder SMITH. All the writers have been severely limited as regards space. In view of their number this was inevitable. But it has one incidental advantage. Instead of expanding on all sorts of secondary matters, the writers have been compelled to concentrate on essentials, and so in most cases we have the real thing presented to us, the thing by which the writer lives.

Most people realize as life goes on that the realm of faith consists of two concentric circles, as it were. In the inner circle are the things on which the soul lives, the things of which you are sure. In the outer circle are the things that are probably true, or (pretty near the outer edge) that are possibly true. At any rate the things that are in the outer circle do not vitally matter. They may be true, and other people may consider them essential. Other people may live by them, but *you* do not. And the experience of most people is this, that there is a steady drift from the inner to the outer circle. Some things that once you were sure of are now only probable or possible. You have ceased to live by them. Your inner circle tends to shrink in size. The outer circle enlarges its bounds. Your creed becomes smaller. But, in compensation, the things in it become surer and more real.

Dr. George JACKSON gives expression to this experience in his brief essay. 'The first thing,' he says, 'that strikes me about my own creed to-day is how much shorter it is than that with which my

Christian life began. Every man's creed, however many may be the clauses in it, is, after all, but as a tiny circle of light in the vast, encompassing darkness. In my own case the darkness has encroached still further on what I once thought was light: I am not so sure now of some things as I was forty years ago. Somebody once remarked, rather acidly, of a group of Christians whom I will not name, that they lengthened the Creed but shortened the Commandments. I have no wish to shorten the Commandments; I have just as little to lengthen the Creed. Even the Apostles' Creed and, still more, the Nicene are too long for me; there is more in both than I can fight for, more in both than I need to live by.

Some time ago a group of ministers was gathered on the shores of a Scottish loch for the purposes of a retreat. The meeting lasted about a week, and towards the end, at one of the conferences, some one asked the question: What would we concentrate on in our minds if we knew we had only five minutes to live? It was suggested that each one of the twenty or thirty men present should make a personal statement. They were all well known to each other, and there was the most complete frankness in all cases. The interesting thing about these personal confessions was the ultimate ground on which each rested his faith and hope. In some cases it was God, the encompassing love of the Father; in other cases it was Christ.

We have the same interesting phenomenon in these essays. Dr. ROBERTS, for example, begins with God, whom he reaches by diverse ways. He finds God in everything, and above all he finds love. 'It is to our human life what sunshine is to the physical world, the spirit of health and healing.' And then he comes down to Christ, as it were, from this eternal reality. 'But why healing? Because physically, mentally and morally somehow things have gone wrong, or at any rate they are wrong. Where love meets ignorance and sin, of necessity there is a cross. The significance of that cross depends on the quality of the love, and where the love of God meets the utmost sin of man, there the life of God is in the form of a cross. Once there dwelt among

us One who accepted these facts so completely and unconditionally that He was led to Calvary.'

And so to the Church. 'He calls us to a fellowship of saviourhood. This is the *raison d'être* of the Church, which may be truer to its function when it is a small community of great souls than when it congratulates itself on being a large community of little souls. Two symbols set forth, in the familiar acts of washing and feeding, the cleansing from defilement and the life of fellowship. Like all symbols they tend, unless carefully watched, to usurp the place of the spiritual realities which they represent.' It is clear that in Dr. ROBERTS' case there is a good deal in the outer circle!

In the case of Dr. George JACKSON, who has the gift of always being interesting, the inner circle is, as he himself suggested, very small. He quotes with appreciation a letter from Dr. John Kelman to himself: 'I am leaving to-day for Edinburgh, where I preach twice to-morrow. May I pass on my subject to you? The morning one is Faith, and the message is: never mind about details, and that deceptive thing called orthodoxy. Get down to the heart of things and stake everything on that. There are a few central things—very few—which mean everything to the soul. Loyalty to these is the essential saving faith. I want to simplify the idea of faith to the very simplest thing—loyalty to a Friend. No other questions matter at all.'

And this is Dr. JACKSON's creed—Christ. Nothing beyond this, and nothing less. 'What do I believe? A single sentence will suffice to tell. "I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord." That is my creed; in a very real sense it is the whole of my creed. . . . Nothing less will suffice, nothing more is necessary. Then, some one may ask, can I not repeat the first words of the Creed? Do I not believe in "God the Father Almighty"? Indeed, I do, but I do because, and only because, I believe in Jesus. The first word in the Christian's creed is not God, it is Jesus. In order that I may be able to say: "I believe in God the Father Almighty," I must first learn to say: "I believe in Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord!"'

Is this correct? In the full Christian sense, certainly, because the full Christian belief in God's Fatherhood is only reached through Jesus. But were not the prophets believers in God? Are not the good Jews believers? And men like Dr. Martineau? It is true that St. Peter says: 'Ye who through Him (Jesus) are believers in God.' But is it not also true that faith in Jesus Himself is reached most easily through faith in God? We have many reasons for believing in God. We may reach that belief, as the psalmists did, through experience of life. And to the soul that has such a faith in God it is not hard to see the fulness of His grace in Jesus Christ. Let us not abate in the least the significance and necessity of Jesus for the full belief in the redeeming grace of God, but let

us not belittle the faith of those who reached God before Jesus, or those who reach Him apart from Jesus.

But with that said we come back to Dr. JACKSON's concentration on Him, and gladly hand on the words he quotes from a Japanese Christian to Dr. Estlin Carpenter, the well-known Unitarian scholar: 'I am more and more drawn to Jesus and the power of His word. . . . I submit myself to Him as my brother, Lord and Saviour. And I go further. . . . Jesus Christ is nearer to me than the Father. When I get despondent in regard to my faith in God, it is Jesus who brings God back to me. . . . He represents to me, so far as I am concerned, all the Divinity I can understand and He is God to me.'

Some Outstanding New Testament Problems.

XII. The Problem of Aramaic Sources in the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR T. W. MANSON, M.A., D.LITT., MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THERE can hardly be any problem in New Testament study offering more room for difference of opinion than this. And wide difference there certainly is. Most scholars would now agree that the authentic pieces of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and the earliest stories about Jesus were originally formulated in Aramaic whether or not they ever took written shape in that language. That is the minimal hypothesis. Few, however, would be prepared to follow Professor Torrey in the view that all four Gospels are translations from Aramaic originals. Between these two extreme views all kinds of solutions are possible, and very little is certain. In what follows I do not propose to do more than set forth the view that seems to me most probable.

The simplest way will be to begin with the two Gospels which are clearly dependent on written sources. Matthew and Luke both make use of Mark, and the Mark they use is in Greek. In addition they have as a common source the document Q. (For reasons which would require a paper to themselves I am unable to accept Bussmann's division of Q into two documents, R and T.)

The amount of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke in Q passages is so great as to exclude the possibility that we have here two independent Greek versions of an original Aramaic Q. On the other hand, it can be shown that the verbal differences can often be explained as translation variants. This situation is almost exactly parallel to that presented by the two Greek versions of the Book of Daniel. There we have the same curious mixture of agreement and difference; and I am inclined to think that the explanation is substantially the same in both cases. We have a Greek version of Daniel in the LXX, and the Greek version revised with reference to the original in Theodotion. Similarly in the case of Q. Here I think that the earlier form of the Greek is that offered by Luke, and the revised version is to be found in Matthew. It is, of course, true that both the Matthaean and Lucan forms of Q are revisions in the sense that both Evangelists made alterations of the text from dogmatic or stylistic motives; but we are not here concerned with such editorial activities, but only with such alterations as appear to arise from reference back to the original Aramaic.

It is in cases of the latter kind that Luke seems to preserve the more primitive form of the Greek, and Matthew to give the revised version.

The most striking example is Lk 11⁴¹, *πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην*, which Wellhausen explained as a mistranslation of Aramaic rightly translated in Mt 23²⁶ by *καθαρίσον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου*. But we are not restricted to such cases. There are others where Luke seems to give the bald and literal translation, while Matthew gives the more elegant and idiomatic rendering. In Lk 6³⁷ *καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε, καὶ οὐ μὴ* renders the common Hebrew and Aramaic *נִלְךָ*. Matthew (7¹) has *μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε*. So in 1 Reg 29⁷ LXX has *καὶ οὐ μὴ*, but Symmachus *ἵνα μὴ*. Similarly Lk 12⁵¹ has the literal *εἰρήνην* . . . *δοῦναι*, while Mt 10³⁴ has *βαλεῖν εἰρήνην*. To this we have a parallel in Jer 37(44)¹⁸, where the Hebrew *עָנַן* is translated by *δίδως* (LXX), *ἐδωκάς* (Aquila), while the elegant Symmachus has *ἐβάλετε*. Lk 7²⁵, *ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις*; Mt 11⁸, *ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλείων*. Cf. Dn 6¹⁸⁽¹⁹⁾ LXX (the original), *εἰς τὰ βασίλεια αὐτοῦ*: Theodotion (the revision), *εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ*. Again, Lk 12³⁹, *ἀφήκεν*: Mt 24⁴³, *εἶασεν*. Cf. Ec 5¹¹ LXX, *ἀφῶν*: Symmachus, *ἔῳ*; Dn 4¹² LXX, *ἀφετε*; Theod., *ἔασατε*; Dn 4²³ LXX, *ἀφεθεῖσα*; Theod., *ἔασατε*. Such cases as these suggest that in Luke we have the more primitive version of a document whose revised translation appears in Matthew.

Apart from cases where Matthew seems to give a revised version of what appears in Luke, there are others where the differences between Matthew and Luke can be explained as variant renderings of an Aramaic original. A very instructive example is the Golden Rule: Mt 7¹², *πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε* . . . Lk 6³¹, *καὶ καθὼς θέλετε* . . . ὅσα ἐὰν translates Hebrew *כְּכָפְךָ* in LXX Gn 44¹; *καθὼς* translates *כְּכָפְךָ* in LXX Gn 82¹ 18⁵ 41¹³. In all cases the Targum has *כְּכָפְךָ*. This gives the equation *ὅσα ἐὰν* = *כְּכָפְךָ* = *καθὼς*. Then Matthew's *πάντα* is left in the air. But we observe that Matthew has a habit of introducing *πᾶς*, where it does not appear in his source, in order to heighten his effects (cf. Mt 13¹⁹ with Mk 4¹⁵; Mt 13³⁴ with Mk 4³³; Mt 13⁵⁶ with Mk 6³, and some eight other cases). The conclusion is that *πάντα* is editorial, while *ὅσα ἐὰν* and *καθὼς* point back to an original Aramaic *כְּכָפְךָ*, of which they are alternative renderings. Of the two *καθὼς* seems to be nearer to the spirit of the ethical teaching of Jesus than *ὅσα ἐὰν*.

A case where Matthew is to be preferred to Luke

is Mt 6²⁸, *οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὐδὲ νήθουσιν*. The Lucan parallel has *οὔτε νήθει οὔτε ὑφαίνει*. Here Luke's singular verbs with the neuter plural subject (*κρίνα*) are a stylistic improvement by the Evangelist. At first sight Luke's 'spin' and 'weave' seems more logical than Matthew's 'toil' and 'spin.' But if spin and weave were the original it is odd that it should have been changed to something less apt. This makes one suspicious of Luke; and suspicion is brought near to certainty when we observe that *κοπιῶσιν* = *כָּבַד* and *νήθουσιν* = *כָּבַד*; that is, that Matthew's text allows for a word-play in Aramaic.

It is not possible, within the limits of the present paper, to bring forward all the evidence that can be collected from Matthew and Luke. It must suffice to say that the more one studies the data, the more one is confirmed in the belief that there is an Aramaic document behind the Greek Q. So far as I can see, the history of it may be reconstructed somewhat as follows. (What follows is a summary of conclusions which I have tried to set out in more detail in a forthcoming work.)

The original Aramaic Q took shape as a manual for the instruction of Aramaic-speaking Christians. It consisted exclusively of teaching, and was arranged topically in what may be regarded as four chapters. The chapter-headings might be given as: I. Jesus and John the Baptist; II. Jesus and His disciples; III. Jesus and His opponents; IV. Eschatology. The original order of the document is best preserved in Luke. This Aramaic document was early translated into Greek; and again the more primitive form of the Greek version appears in Luke, subject, of course, to the editorial modifications—largely stylistic—made by that Evangelist. At a later stage the Greek version was revised with reference to the original Aramaic; and this revised version was used by Matthew, who introduced editorial modifications of his own and broke up and rearranged the material in accordance with the plan of his own Gospel.

So much can be inferred from the internal evidence. The only piece of external evidence, which may have a bearing on the matter, is the much-discussed fragment of Papias quoted by Eusebius. Here, again, it is not possible to do more than state the case in the barest outline. It is, I think, clear that Eusebius, and Papias before him, believed the fragment to refer to the first Gospel as we have it. Both were mistaken. The statements contained in the fragment will not fit canonical Matthew, and it can be shown in detail that they do fit the document Q. This involves

the theory that the Papias fragment is a piece of tradition older than Papias himself, a view which seems to me inherently probable. No one who has pondered what Eusebius has to say about the intelligence of Papias will find it easy to believe that the historian would have wet his pen to record the private opinion of Papias on matters of Biblical criticism. One does not quote as an authority the person whom one has just described as little better than an idiot.

We may therefore take it that the fragment embodies a tradition older than the time of Papias. This tradition says that Matthew composed 'the Logia' in the Hebrew language and that each interpreted it as he was able. In this context 'the Hebrew language' probably means, as in Ac 21⁴⁰ 22², the spoken language of Palestine, *i.e.* Aramaic. The internal evidence suggests that Q was composed in Aramaic and that at least two interpretations of it into Greek were in existence. So far the tradition agrees with the data.

It is, however, objected that 'the Logia' is not a correct description of Q. The objection has been stated with great fullness by Bacon and Donovan. There is, I think a complete answer to both; and it can be shown that 'the Logia' is a perfectly accurate description of Q in terms of its contents. On three points out of four the tradition fits the document Q. The fourth, Matthaean authorship, is not capable of definite proof or disproof. All that can be said is that if the tradition accords with the facts in three points out of four, there is a reasonable probability that the fourth point also will be true to fact.

If the above argument is sound, there is a fairly strong case for an original Aramaic Q; and it is, I think, the strongest case that can be made out for an Aramaic written source in the Gospels. The others are much more a matter of conjecture.

We may turn now to the matter peculiar to Matthew and Luke. The Lucan matter offers little or no encouragement to the hunter of written Aramaic documents. For the most part the blocks of L material show no sign of having existed as a document before they were incorporated in the Gospel of Luke. We seem to have just a collection of anecdotes, parables, and sayings, the kind of thing that might have been produced by a diligent collector of oral traditions. That is the general impression; but it requires modification at three points: (1) The Birth and Infancy narratives (1⁵⁻²⁵²) seem to be a self-contained whole; but this section is probably not to be assigned to the L material proper, and there does

not seem to be any good reason for regarding it as a translation from Aramaic. (2) The Apocalyptic passage (21⁵⁻³⁶), after removal of the verses which are obviously borrowed from Mk 13, seems to be a unity. I am inclined, though with considerable hesitation, to regard it as independent of Mk 13 and possibly a more primitive form of the 'Apocalyptic broadsheet,' especially if the hypothesis is sound that Mk 13¹⁴ is a reference to the threatened profanation of the Temple by Caligula. But, again, one does not find any definite indications of a written Aramaic source, though it seems intrinsically probable enough that such a document would circulate first in the native dialect. (3) Between Lk 15¹ and 19¹⁰ there is a collection of passages peculiar to Luke, which can be grouped together under the title of 'The Gospel of the Outcast.' Whether these passages are derived from a written source or not can hardly be determined. The grouping may be due to the Evangelist himself. And again there does not seem to be any special reason for supposing that an Aramaic document lies behind the collection.

The matter peculiar to Matthew presents an even more difficult problem. The editorial methods of the Evangelist make it an almost impossible task to disentangle his sources; and in the matter under consideration we have not the help afforded by Mark and Luke on other contexts. There are indications here and there of dependence on a Semitic source or sources; but very little can be said with any sort of confidence. There are, however, a few points worth mentioning: (1) Matthew's narrative of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus may be derived from a Hebrew original, if anything can be based on the observation of Torrey that the word-play involved in Mt 1²¹, 'Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει, is possible only in Hebrew and not in Aramaic. (2) In Mt 5³⁷ we have ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναὶ οὐ οὐ. This is almost certainly a mistranslation, and the correct rendering is in Ja 5¹², ἦτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ. (3) It is in the matter peculiar to Matthew that we find most frequently Rabbinical technical terms; and here also the sayings of Jesus often appear in forms which can be paralleled almost word for word in the Rabbinical literature. But while the Palestinian background is very obvious, there is little evidence to prove dependence on written Aramaic or Hebrew sources rather than Palestinian oral tradition, and, so far as one can see, still less for determining the extent of such a source or sources.

In the case of Mark the situation is equally obscure. It is just possible to read the Papias

tradition in such a way that the Gospel becomes a record of the oral tradition of Peter. And it is, I think, permissible to regard the Petrine tradition as the backbone of the document. In that case, if we take 'interpreter' literally, we may think of Peter as giving his story in Aramaic and John Mark as having preserved this Aramaic oral tradition and having set it down in writing in a Greek version of his own. But the question remains, how much of the Gospel as it stands can fairly be regarded as coming under the category of Petrine oral tradition. Even so cautious a scholar as the late C. H. Turner felt bound to exclude one of the stories of the feeding of the multitude; and others would go much further.

It is, for example, quite possible that the so-called 'Little Apocalypse' circulated as a separate document. If it did, there is some probability that it was written first in the language of Palestine for Palestinian readers. Again, it is possible that the passage 4²⁻³⁴ gives an extract from a larger collection of parables; but there is no means of proving that this supposed collection was a written document. The selection might as well be made from what Peter remembered as from what some one else had written down. Another suspected passage is the account of the death of the Baptist (Mk 6). Whether or not this story is 'Petrine,' it would certainly seem to be of Aramaic origin if τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος is anything to go by. But, again, the question remains: oral tradition or written source?

The problem of the origin of Mark is one of the most important and pressing in New Testament criticism. We have the early testimony that this Gospel rests upon the oral teaching of Peter. The primary task is to study the Gospel section by section with a view to determining how much in it answers to that description. For this purpose no better starting-point could be found than the work of Turner, in his articles on Marcan usage in the *Journal of Theological Studies* and in his Commentary. It is only when we have settled our accounts with the Papias tradition that we are entitled to look round for other possible sources in Mark.

The Fourth Gospel presents an even more bewildering problem than the Synoptics. It has been claimed that the whole book is a translation from Aramaic, and the late Professor Burney brought forward a large array of evidence for the theory. It was pointed out at the time—I think by Mr. G. R. Driver—that the Aramaisms relied upon by Burney occurred mostly in the discourse portions

of the Gospel. More recently Professor Torrey has argued for the Aramaic origin with a fresh set of proofs. The question is further complicated by the studies of the Manchester Hellenistic Seminar, concerning which I am dependent on oral tradition. They are reported to have studied 1 John with Burney's argument in mind, and to have found that the alleged Aramaisms in the Gospel do not occur at all in the Epistle. Added to this is the fact that while quotations from the Old Testament are fairly frequent in the Gospel, they are absent from the Epistle. Finally, there is the fact that the Fourth Gospel is thought to be dependent in certain sections on Mark and Luke. These facts call for a full and fresh investigation of the whole question. I have not been able to do more than make a rough survey of the problem, and the remarks which follow must be regarded as very tentative. (1) The Aramaisms relied on by Burney are not evenly spread over the Gospel. They come in blocks. (2) The Old Testament quotations are found in the sections marked by the presence of Aramaisms. (3) Torrey's Aramaisms are more evenly distributed than Burney's; but there are a good many paragraphs in which neither Burney nor Torrey notes an Aramaism. (4) On the whole the passages in John which are regarded as dependent on the Synoptics fall in the parts that are marked by the absence of Aramaisms. (5) If the Gospel and First Epistle are by the same hand, the absence of Aramaisms in the Epistle would indicate that their presence in the Gospel is not the result of 'thinking in Aramaic while writing in Greek,' but due rather to the presence of an Aramaic source in the Gospel. When the writer has a free hand he does not Aramaize. (6) The presence of the peculiar Johannine manner even in those passages of the Gospel which are marked by the presence of Aramaisms suggests that even if an Aramaic source lies behind the Gospel, it has been freely worked over by the Evangelist and that nothing much can be hoped for from retranslation into Aramaic.

With that we may conclude. The only case in which one can feel fairly confident that a written Aramaic source lies behind the Gospels is that of the document Q. I think it very probable that such an Aramaic document existed and that it is the writing referred to in the tradition handed down by Papias. It is also, I think, probable that much of the matter peculiar to Matthew is derived from an Aramaic document or documents. It is at least possible that an Aramaic document is one

of the sources of the Fourth Gospel. Mark and the matter peculiar to Luke seem to me to depend on oral tradition rather than written Aramaic sources, though a great part of this oral tradition was doubtless Palestinian and, in the first instance, Aramaic.

Note.—Since the above was set up in type, an important article by Professor E. Littmann has appeared in the *ZNW*, xxxiv. pp. 20–34. This article contains a detailed discussion of Torrey's work on the Gospels. Littmann (p. 34) regards it as probable that Mark is a translation from Aramaic.

Littmann's article leads me to add a note on

another point. In the story of the Centurion of Capernaum, Torrey gets over the difficulty in Mt 8⁹, Lk 7⁸ by supposing a confusion of the active and passive participles מְסִים and סִים. He is then able to translate 'exercising authority' rather than 'set under authority,' and this gives a good sense. But Littmann points out that in unpointed Aramaic the participles are commonly distinguished, the active being written סַם and the passive סִם. In my opinion the solution of the difficulty lies elsewhere, in the ambiguity of the Aramaic preposition חַחוּת=ἵπó. Aramaic חַחוּת, like Hebrew חַח means both 'under' and 'in place of.' What the centurion said was, in effect, 'I am the representative of the Government.'

Literature.

THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL.

READERS of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES need no reminder of the way in which Canon J. Battersby-Harford has followed up the work done years ago by his brother on the Pentateuch. He has now laid all serious students of the Old Testament under a fresh obligation by his new book on Ezekiel—*Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). We have learnt to recognize in him a gift for summarizing and assessing the work of other scholars, a searching and decisive method in criticism, and an unlimited capacity for that exhaustive drudgery without which no conclusions can be valid. Others may be content with general impressions; when Dr. Battersby-Harford tells us that a phrase is commoner in one book than in another, his statement is mathematically accurate.

The new work falls into three parts; nearly one-third is given to the statement of earlier theories, particularly those of Hölscher, Torrey, James Smith, and Herntrich, about half that amount to the author's positive contribution to the subject, and just over half the book to a tabular exposition of two linguistic points which have been regarded as pivotal by certain critics. These are the use of the phrase 'House of Israel,' and the double divine name ('Adonai Yahweh'), which appears in Ezekiel no less than two hundred and seventeen times out of a total of three hundred and five for the

whole of the Old Testament. Needless to say, the evidence of the Versions is given due place in this discussion.

The views of earlier scholars are stated with absolute fairness; Canon Battersby-Harford is an ideal antagonist. Hölscher's drastic surgery, Torrey's theory of a third-century controversialist writing as though he lived under Manasseh, Smith's attribution of the book to a seventh-century North Israelite, Herntrich's location of the prophet in pre-exilic Jerusalem—all are set before us with lucid brevity. There follows a critical discussion which is always strict—indeed, in dealing with Dr. Smith it is devastating. Even in his position, however, Dr. Battersby-Harford is prepared to find positive virtues, and he frankly admits the contribution made also by the other three to the elucidation of the critical problems with which the book bristles. He uses much of their work in his own reconstruction, which he sums up himself under two heads: (1) that 'the main body of the prophecies bear all the marks of delivery in person to the people in their own land,' while there are 'later passages which attribute them to a prophet living in exile in Babylon, who may or may not be Ezekiel himself.' This is the author of chapters 40–42. (2) Criteria for the separation of these two elements can be found in 'the vision of i. 4–28b, with the later references to it and certain characteristic phrases (as in xl. 1–3).' We must congratulate Canon Battersby-Harford on a piece of

work which is indispensable to every one who wishes to know the lines on which the modern study of Ezekiel is proceeding.

COMMUNISM.

In the Preface to his Beckly Lecture for 1935—*Communism, Christian and Marxist* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net)—Mr. Herbert G. Wood tells us that his handling of this great theme has not satisfied himself. That is in accord with his native modesty. But his readers, who ought to be numerous, may well feel that the imperfections of the book are not due to any incompetence on his part, but to the exigencies of time and space, and still more to the difficulties which beset the subject. In spite of his own misgivings, his little book reveals his well-balanced and penetrating mind.

Many recent writings on the same subject have shown distinct signs of panic. Mr. Wood refers to some of these and points the way to soundness and sobriety. He gives ample acknowledgment to the merits of communistic experiments, but argues strongly that these merits are not organic to the fundamental principles of Communism of the Marxist order. For instance, whatever genuine success has followed Bolshevik planning in Russia can be secured equally well by planning which has nothing to do with Bolshevism. But what is much more important, the kind of planning which the economic world needs to-day will avoid the bitter fruits of Bolshevism by recognizing the supremacy of the spiritual and allowing a field for individual freedom and initiative. It will see the wisdom of letting public control and private control go on side by side, the proportion between the two being determined not by doctrinaire theory, but by the dictates of experience.

It is not within the scope of the book to attempt any detailed scheme over against the Russian plan. Mr. Wood has undertaken a comparison of the Christian with the Marxist type of Communism, and he makes it plain that these differ *toto coelo* from each other. According to Lenin, conflict is the absolute. 'We do not believe in eternal principles of morality and we will oppose this deception. Communistic morality is identical with the fight for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.' Such is a fair sample of the avowed principles of Marxist Communism as it is being put into practice in Russia, and any one who supposes that such principles can issue in anything in the long run but horrible evil and apocalyptic ruin, or that Christianity can make any compromise

with such principles, has lost all sense of proportion and is playing with fire. A system which is founded upon the notion that religion is the opiate of the people, that morality must be made subservient to politics and violence, and that science and the proletarian revolution can alone bring salvation, is a system to which anything that can be called Christian Communism must be resolutely opposed. The only kind of Communism that Christianity can recognize is the Fellowship of the Spirit, and that is a fellowship in faith and hope and love. Marxist Communism is a sinister travesty of it. We heartily commend Mr. Wood's book.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

Undoubtedly one of the most ambitious adventures in the annals of book publishing is the series entitled 'The History of Civilization' which is being published by Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. under the editorship of Mr. C. K. Ogden, M.A. The latest addition to the series is *Jesus*, by Professor Ch. Guignebert, who lectures in the Sorbonne on the History of Christianity. The translation from the French has been made by Professor S. H. Hooke of the Chair of Old Testament Studies in the University of London. The price of the volume is 25s. net.

An elaborate Foreword is supplied by M. Henri Berr, who is collaborating with the leading savants of France in the production of the new series, 'L'Evolution de l'Humanité,' which is being incorporated in 'The History of Civilization' above named. In this Foreword are sketched the outlines of the figure of the historical Jesus, as it is represented by Guignebert as the result of his critical investigation, and Berr concludes, following up Guignebert's representation: 'Thanks to the progress of historical criticism, we are enabled to understand the peculiar and ambiguous nature of the influence exercised by Jesus. The faith that he inspired—for the reason that he himself was filled with a simple and overwhelming faith—made on the souls of men an impression of which the effects, near and remote, would have astonished him. His transfigured person became the centre of a doctrine which he himself had neither foreseen nor desired. Christianity issued from Christ; but it cannot be said that he was its founder.'

It will be gathered that the life of Jesus which is before us in this volume is on advanced modern lines; and it is in keeping with the above that the belief in the Resurrection is stated to be the result of a return of confidence in Jesus on the part of

Peter and his companions, which the unexpected arrest and crucifixion of their Master had almost shattered. It is possible, adds Guignebert, that Peter had a visual hallucination, but it is also possible that the state of anxious expectancy in which he lived and the indefinite but irresistible hope which sustained him may have created their object for him, that is to say, caused him to interpret some visual phenomenon, much more indeterminate than an hallucination, as a manifestation of the presence of Jesus.

While, of course, such a position and explanation will not satisfy the conservative critic, he cannot but be impressed with the scholarship, learning, and eloquence that characterize this work. Two-fifths of the work treat of the Life of Jesus, two-fifths of the Teaching, while the remainder deals with the Death of Jesus and the Easter Faith. And such is the scope of the work, and so eminent its author, that the publishers claim that Professor Guignebert's contribution is 'the fullest and most authoritative study of the life of Jesus that has appeared for many years.'

Points of special interest are his elaborate treatment of the sources for the Life of Jesus, his refutation of the mythological explanation of the Christian movement, and his discussion of the personal appearance and mental characteristics of Jesus; and other points of special interest might also be named. On the subject of the method of *Formgeschichte* he remarks that it is not so entirely novel, as its ingenious practitioners appear to think. It was introduced by J. Weiss and Loisy, but it has now been systematized, and a great service thereby rendered to exegesis. He further remarks that it is only a special and somewhat limited application of the historical method. Nor has it revolutionized anything. Even so radically negative a critique as that of Bultmann in his 'History of the Synoptic Tradition' (1921), issued in his 'Jesus' (1926) in a kind of revival of faith 'well calculated to delight the conservatives.'

THE COSMIC TRAGEDY.

God: A Cosmic Philosophy of Religion (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net) is a sequel to other works on religious philosophy by the same author, Dr. John Elof Boodin, who is Professor of Philosophy in the University of California. It consists of a series of eight essays written at different times and some of them already published in the 'Hibbert Journal' and elsewhere. The titles of the essays—'The Crisis,' 'The Idea of God,' 'God and Cosmic

Structure,' 'The Universe a Living Whole,' 'A Dualistic Cosmology,' 'Matter, Space, and God,' 'The Cosmic Tragedy,' 'Divine Laughter'—are sufficient to indicate that, if the essays are bound together by the thread of consistency of thought, they do not constitute a logically progressive development of the general theme.

The author's standpoint is theistic and liberally Christian, and he presents his 'cosmic philosophy of religion' in an attractive and often eloquent style, illuminated by quotations from the poets, such as Wordsworth and Walt Whitman. The presentation is in line with the progress of history and science. A good and characteristic example of the essays is that on 'The Cosmic Tragedy,' which does not appear to have been already published in any form, and parts of which we would now place before our readers.

It begins by saying, with Maeterlinck, that 'the web of our life is of a mingled yarn, good and ill together,' and then proceeds to put the question Which dominates? Is life fundamentally comedy or tragedy?

From any naturalistic point of view, whether that of the hard naturalism of yesterday or the soft idealized naturalism of to-day, Nature is indifferent to individuals and their hopes, offering no goal except dust and ashes, and life is a tragedy, spelling futility and defeat. And a pan-cosmic idealism is merely an inverted naturalism. To say that mind alone exists, and that the sensible world of earth and stars is but a projected shadow of mind, is to translate Nature into a dream, but yet it is not emancipation from Nature. The tragedy of Nature becomes the tragedy of mind, which is nothing but the subjective feeling of matter.

If we measure life in terms of happiness, it is no less tragic. Naturalistic optimism has no remedy against the mystery of death. All death in the order of Nature is a tragedy. It respects no quality of life. It destroys the noble and the ignoble alike. It robs love of its fulfilment. All love is lovely when it is idealized by imagination and freed from carnal desire; and the more spiritualized, the lovelier the communion of love becomes. But the sad thought steals into the moment of joy; it cannot last.

In this mortal world the individual goes under in the struggle. But if he has caught a glimpse of eternal meaning, and realized the vision of beauty even for a moment, he has proved himself superior to the course of Nature. In his very tragedy he takes on a divine quality. A vista is opened up to him into the meaning of life. Nature is perceived

to be not an end in itself, but an instrument for realizing spirit. And only spirit is immortal. And spirit is conserved in the life of the eternal Spirit, who creates the universe out of mortal chaos, travelling throughout all the ages.

It is not given to us to understand how finite spirit persists in the enveloping field of Spirit. But the Eternal Spirit of the ages may say: 'I cannot give permanency to spirit *in* the world. But I am not of the world, and I shall save what is significant in spirit out of the wreck of the world. If your life is tragic, do I not suffer with you? If you die with me, shall you not also be resurrected with me? For I am the resurrection and life eternal.'

Life, concludes our author, is ever the mingling of two strains—the jangling passions of Nature and the celestial chorus of our ideals. The strain of our ideals, though almost submerged at times in the discords of this world, is the eternal inspiration of life. And if we remain loyal to our faith in a kingdom we cannot see, with undying hope for a better future, and with a love that works unceasingly for its actuality, we shall in some mystic moment feel an intimation of the divine harmony, and dying with God will also be for us rising with God. The true mystery of the Cross is that love is victorious through suffering.

EVOLUTION.

We welcome a new book by the Rev. Dr. R. R. Marett, the well-known writer on Anthropology and the History of Religion. It is entitled *Head, Heart, and Hands in Human Evolution* (Hutchinson; 2s. 6d. net). The work is in three distinct parts, although a certain unity pervades the whole. In the first we have three valuable discussions of evolution and progress, fact and value, race and society. It is all interesting, and some of the points made are very important though they are often neglected. The second section deals with pre-theological religion in general, and the discussion treats of religious feeling, thinking, and acting. To this is added another group of chapters on ritualism as a disease of religion, the sacrament of food, religion and the means of life, religion and trade, religion and blood-revenge, war- and love-charms, the medicine-man, taboo, totems.

The third section of the book—though it is numbered part four—deals with primitive technology, and is in two chapters—one on arts and crafts of prehistoric man, and the other on arts and crafts of the modern savage.

It will thus be seen that the contents are sufficiently varied to arouse wide interest. The reader has here in convenient compass a mass of information not to be easily obtained, and may be well assured that he is in the care of a master of the subjects handled. Scholarly in substance, the book is written in delightful literary style.

BRADLEY'S ESSAYS.

For half a century onwards from 1874, Mr. F. H. Bradley occupied an outstanding place among British philosophical writers. His four books—'The Principles of Logic,' 'Essays on Truth and Reality,' 'Ethical Studies,' and 'Appearance and Reality'—were notable contributions when they first were issued, and they still command attention. All evince power of thought, brilliant critical faculty, and literary grace. In addition, Mr. Bradley produced a considerable number of essays on philosophical subjects which appeared mostly in the pages of various journals. In the two handsome volumes now in our hands, *Collected Essays* (Milford; 36s. net), these have been reprinted in chronological order along with two that are here printed for the first time. It was well worth while to rescue them from the sepulchre of magazine files. Each has its own interest, and the intrinsic value of quite a few of them is great. The chronological arrangement has its obvious utility in enabling one to watch the development of the thought of a singularly brilliant mind.

A book on married life which is frank and comprehensive is a decided acquisition. And this, and more, can be said for *Growing Together in the Family*, by Mr. Leland Foster Wood, Ph.D. (Abingdon Press; 50 c.). Everything is discussed—finance, children, religion, temper, and a hundred matters. It is a wise book.

Professor N. O. Lossky, of the Russian University in Prague, and Professor John S. Marshall, of Albion College, have collaborated to produce *Value and Existence* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). Professor Lossky writes Part I., which has been admirably translated by Mr. Sergei Vinokooroff; in Part II. and in the Preface, Professor Marshall expounds his master's views. The book is illuminative and stimulating. A valuable chapter in the first part is that which subjects to penetrating criticism the theories of Meinong, Heyde, Scheler, and others.

Epistemologically Lossky shows affinities with S. Alexander, metaphysically he is reminiscent of Dean Inge; in his treatment of Evil he reminds us of Royce. All through, however, the independence and originality of his own thought are manifest. In characteristically Russian mode the whole treatment is imbued with deep religious feeling. The view set forth may be described as a modified Neo-Platonism. Professor Marshall's part has been well done and is a very real help to our understanding.

'Within a long generation practically the whole content of inherited Christianity has come up for re-examination, asked to be taken back into the Christian mind and re-issued, charged with proper power and meaning for its contemporaneous world.' This is the task for the Christian preacher, says Professor Gaius G. Atkins in *Preaching and the Mind of To-day* (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net). Accordingly, the Professor sketches the mind of to-day and shows how the preacher is to interpret the Christian revelation to it. One of the best chapters is 'The Challenge of Secularism,' but the whole book is suggestive and stimulating.

Mr. Joseph Malins, M.A., has written a Memoir of the Rev. *Wilson Stuart, M.A., B.Sc.* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). It will have a special appeal to those who are actively engaged in the Temperance cause, for from 1919 till the time of his death Mr. Stuart was Organizing Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance. After a brilliant academic career, followed by a number of years in the Methodist ministry, Mr. Stuart gave up his prospects there and hopes of promotion to devote all his time and strength to the Temperance crusade. What he was may be gathered in some measure from the letter written after his death by Mr. W. E. 'Pussyfoot' Johnson to Mr. Stuart's sister—Miss Mary Stuart. 'Your letter telling of the passing of Wilson came as a grievous shock to me. I loved that man. He was so big—big in body, in mind, and heart. When I think of him, I always think of that wild night at Essex Hall. He fought for my protection with the fury of a tiger.'

'But you must let your grief give place to pride that you had such a brother, just as I find satisfaction in the fellowship that kept us together.'

The Fernley-Hartley Lectureship has produced some notable volumes, and *Jesus and the Moralists*, a comparative study of the Christian ethic, by the Rev. Edward Wales Hirst, M.A., B.Sc. (Epworth

Press; 5s. net), is worthy to stand beside the best. Its contents can be guessed from the title. Mr. Hirst discusses the great ethical systems and teachers of history, and compares them at all points with the ethical teaching of Jesus. The critical summary at the close is noteworthy. The book is in the best sense educative, for the author knows his material so well and handles it so lightly that his discussion is interesting throughout. Hellenism, Stoicism, Rationalism, Hedonism, and Modern Humanism are examined in turn, and the supremacy of Jesus vindicated.

Four more volumes of the 'God and Life' Series have been issued by the Epworth Press (3s. 6d. net each). *Have Faith in God*, by the Rev. Norman H. Snaith, M.A., deals with the problem of the suffering of the righteous as it appears in the Psalms, and shows how the Psalmists' answers were reached and how they were bettered in the New Testament. *What I Believe*, edited by Mr. B. Aquila Barber, is a symposium to which forty-two writers contribute, stating, each in a thousand words, what his personal creed is. *The Heavenly Octave* is a study of the Beatitudes by that ever-fresh writer, the Rev. F. W. Boreham, D.D. It is suggestive, and full of bright illustration. *Methodist Good Companions*, by Mrs. G. Elsie Harrison, B.A., contains a series of interesting biographical studies of Methodist saints.

Miracles and Critics (Faith Press; 3s. net), by the Rev. Hubert S. Box, B.D., Ph.D., to which a foreword is provided by the Bishop of Gloucester, is an exposition and a defence of the traditional view of the miraculous in reply to the attacks of its critics. The writer gives a useful historical survey of the attack against the Gospel miracles, and each critic is allowed to put his case in his own words. Indeed, the quotations in this little volume form no small part of its value. On the whole, attention is concentrated on the philosophical aspects of the question, and these are treated with great lucidity. Sanction is given to the claim that miracles provide an 'incontrovertible' testimony to the supernatural, and it is asserted that the purpose of Christ's miracles 'was to lead men to accept His Divine mission and Divine sonship.' There is much that is of value in the book, especially a useful account of modern methods of healing by suggestion and autosuggestion, but the writer deals too summarily with the historical difficulties raised by the modern study of the Gospels. It is surprising that so exhaustive an investigation of the

whole problem as Professor C. J. Wright's 'Miracle in History and in Modern Thought' (1930) is not mentioned.

What Religion Is and Does, by Professor Horace T. Houf of Ohio (Harper Brothers; \$3.00), has been written to supply what the author has found to be a distinct need as suggested to him by the persistent questions asked by his students. It takes its title from the first two chapters which answer respectively what religion is, and what religion does. Then we have a discussion of the oft-handled topic of the relation of science, and of some sciences in particular, to religious faith and practice. Hebrew-Christian Religion gets a Part II. to itself. The book is somewhat overloaded, and the 'natural theology' is not too convincing, but there is much that is well said and persuasively argued.

Polarity (Milford; 8s. 6d. net), by Mr. P. Erich Przywara, S.J., translated by the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D., is 'A German Catholic's Interpretation of Religion.' The author, a Munich Jesuit, is a religious philosopher of high standing in modern Germany. The translator is a well-known Anglican scholar. The title of the work is not of the author's own choosing, but has been given by the translator, in view of the author's 'reiterated emphasis upon opposing yet complementary poles of thought, upon tensions, rhythms, oscillations, explosions, and balanced unities.'

There is a certain topical interest in this essay. It is largely a defence of the fundamental principle of the *analogia entis* (God and Creation, as the principle is classically expressed in Roman Catholic doctrine, are like one another, but even in their similarity unlike one another), and this principle has been vigorously attacked by Karl Barth in recent years in the presentation of the New Evangelicalism.

It must be a difficult essay to read in German. It is certainly difficult to follow in the English translation. Dr. Bouquet tells us that he has kept as faithfully as he could to the text, even at the risk of clumsiness. We daresay he could have avoided it only by recasting the whole work.

When the Revised Church Hymnary was issued a Handbook was brought out at the same time, designed to give information about the hymns and their writers, which would make the use of the Hymnary more pleasurable and edifying. The Handbook was both interesting and valuable, but

there were omissions, and additional material has appeared in the intervening years (since 1927), so that a supplement has become a necessity. This has now appeared—*Handbook to the Church Hymnary Supplement*, edited by the Rev. Millar Patrick, D.D. (Milford; 1s. 6d. net). In addition to the new material indicated, a great deal of interesting information is given in the supplement about psalm tunes which were not included in the Hymnary. The name of the editor is sufficient guarantee that the book is scholarly and reliable as well as interesting.

We have received three volumes of sermons from Messrs. Pickering & Inglis. One of these is a small paper-bound volume costing only 6d. and containing eight sermons by Dr. W. Graham Scroggie. The title is *Eight Things that Matter*, and it was suggested to Dr. Scroggie by Lord Riddell's book with the title 'Some Things that Matter.' What are these eight spiritual qualities that matter so profoundly? They are 'Assurance of Salvation,' 'Yieldedness to God,' 'Knowledge of the Bible,' 'Power in Prayer,' 'Missionary-Mindedness,' 'Specific Service,' 'Christian Stewardship,' and 'Spiritual Fellowship.'

Before Dr. Stuart Holden died he had agreed that the addresses which he gave at the Port-stewart Convention in 1934 should be published, and wished them dedicated to Mr. Stephens Richardson, the Chairman of the Convention. Dr. Holden did not live to see the addresses prepared for the press, but eight of them have now been collected and published with the title *Some Old Testament Parables* (1s. net). They will be treasured by the friends in Ireland who heard them and by the many others in all parts of the world—for Dr. Holden was a great traveller—who owed to him the deepening of their spiritual life.

The third volume contains six sermons by the late Rev. John McNeill. They have been chosen from his early volumes. The title is *I Go A Fishing* (1s. net).

From the same publishers also comes *They that Sow* (3s. 6d.), short studies by Miss Mary Warburton Booth dealing with different aspects of her work in India. In one chapter, 'Where are the Reapers?' she tells how she had a copy of the Report of the Keswick Convention with her and read to two Indian women a sermon that Dr. Stuart Holden had preached. One of them was a Brahman. "See me! See me!" she cried. "I was a Brahman. I am not that now. I am Thine. I have been too proud for Thee to dwell with me.

I know it. Forgive—forgive!”’ The preacher at Keswick had delivered his message.

Four Girls and a Fortune (2s. net) is a story by Miss Esther E. Enock which might very suitably be given to girls in their teens.

What Shakespeare knew of the Bible, where he got his knowledge (in school? in church? through home teaching? through personal study?), and what use he made of his knowledge, are questions discussed in a scholarly and elaborate study presented in *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer*, as exemplified in the plays of the First Folio, by Mr. Richmond Noble (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). This is a notable book by an expert who knows all that has been written on his subject, and has reached his conclusions through prolonged study. He discusses the Tudor printed versions of Scripture, and the extent and value of the poet's acquaintance with them. Over a hundred and fifty pages are devoted to a detailed examination of the references in the plays.

A book of popular apologetic has been written by Mr. McEwan Lawson, *Adventure and Discovery* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). The aim of the book is to help the ‘ordinary man’ (and especially the ordinary young man) who, in these bewildering days, is wondering, in face of science, psychology, and higher criticism what he can believe. And this aim the writer, on the whole, achieves with considerable success. He is obviously alive to all that is being written in discredit of the Christian faith. And he does not make the mistake of underestimating the enemy. These qualities inspire confidence, and throughout the book we are agreeably conscious of the writer's own honestly and modestly held convictions. It is not a profound book. We are sometimes left with questions that have not really been satisfactorily answered. But there is a great deal of help to be got from the points the writer makes. And it may be that the ‘ordinary man’ will find more in these slight discussions than he would in a much deeper and more thorough treatment. It ought to be added that the book is written in such a fresh and vivid style that one finds it difficult to lay it down. Mr. Lawson has done a real service to a class of religious people who need guidance and assurance more perhaps than any other.

The latest additions to the ‘Religion and Life

Books’—the 1s. reprint series which the S.C.M. is publishing—are *The Christian Adventure*, by the Rev. A. Herbert Gray, D.D., and *Christ and Money*, by the Rev. Hugh Martin, M.A. Both books are too well known to require commendation. The first has passed through ten editions. *Christ and Money* was first published in December 1926. In the earlier edition we must have somehow missed the author's foreword, for this pleasant paragraph is new to us. ‘The Irish peasant who was asked the way to Ballymore, after much cogitation replied, “If it's Ballymore you want to get to, it's not from here I would be advising you to start.” It is very inconvenient to have to start from A.D. 1926 in an endeavour to reach the Kingdom of God, but that is where we are.’

Three perfectly charming little books—Bible Books for Small People—have been prepared by the Student Christian Movement Press (1s. 6d. net) for children from three to six years of age. One is bound in blue, one in red, and one in green. They are only four inches by five and a half inches, and they are called respectively *Hosanna to the King*, *The Nobleman's Son*, and *Jesus, Friend of Little Children*. The author is Miss Muriel Chalmers, and the delightful coloured illustrations are done by Miss Roberta F. C. Waudby.

A Pilgrimage to Palestine, by the Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D., should now be within the reach of every one, for the sales of the early editions have enabled the Student Christian Movement Press to publish a cheap edition at 5s. net.

A delightful monograph on the famous ‘Malines Conversations,’ and the part played in them especially by the late Lord Halifax, is presented in *A Catholic Memorial of Lord Halifax and Cardinal Mercier*, by the Rev. Anselm Bolton, B.D. (Williams & Norgate; 3s. 6d. net). Every one knows the extreme Anglo-Catholic position held by Lord Halifax, and his passionate ambition for the reunion of the Church of England with Rome. The nearest efforts got to fulfilment was at the Conferences at Malines, which were held largely through the broad-minded catholicity of Cardinal Mercier. The whole story is told here again, and is of endless interest.

The Problem of the Cross.

By PROFESSOR J. M. SHAW, D.D., QUEEN'S THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, KINGSTON, ONTARIO.

THE Cross is indeed not first a problem but a fact. But the problem of the Cross is to explain how such a fact can be given such a significance as is given to it both in the New Testament and in Christian experience through the centuries.

I.

The greatness of this problem will be best realized by emphasizing first the nature of the fact as a simple fact of history. The fact of Jesus' death on the Cross is a fact recorded not only in Sacred Scripture but also in the pages of Roman history. The Roman historian Tacitus in his *Annals*, book xv. ch. 45, referring to what he calls the 'sect' of the Christians in connexion with their being blamed for the burning of Rome in A.D. 64, makes this statement in regard to the founder of the sect: 'Christus was put to death by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius.'

As thus recorded in Roman history the death of Jesus is viewed as the death of a 'criminal.' That indeed is the very word the Roman historian uses—the death of one who died, not of old age, nor of disease, nor of accident, but of one who was put to death in the prime of life, and that the most cruel and shameful death of crucifixion, on the ostensible charge of being a traitor or rebel against the Roman Emperor. The real crime indeed of which He was found guilty and condemned to death by the Jewish ecclesiastical authorities was that of blasphemy—claiming to be the Christ, the Son of God. But this not being a crime of which the Roman civil law could take cognizance, when Jesus was brought before the Roman authorities for the necessary ratification of the death sentence passed on Him by the Jewish Court, the charge against Him was changed from one of blasphemy against God to that of sedition or treason against the Roman Emperor—the charge, namely, of claiming to be Himself a King, thus perverting the Jews against Roman authority and allegiance. So it came about that it was this latter charge—the charge of being a traitor or rebel against the Roman Emperor and government, 'Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews'—that was the offence or accusation inscribed upon His Cross, according to the custom of the time, that when a criminal

was sentenced to be crucified his name and the accusation against him should be placarded above his head at his execution.

This, then, is how the death of Jesus on the Cross was regarded from the point of view of simple secular history, namely, as 'a judicial execution,' the execution or murder of one who was condemned to death as a dangerous political agitator, a traitor and rebel against Roman authority. We may say that His execution on such a charge was unjust and unscrupulous, 'a judicial error,' as we say; that the charge against Him was not legally substantiated. Lawyers now acknowledge this. Pilate himself acknowledged it. But unjust or not, this is how His death was viewed from the point of view of contemporary Roman history, as the death of a criminal and as such, from His own point of view and that of His friends and relatives, an unspeakable tragedy and disgrace.

II.

But when we come to the New Testament and to Sacred Scripture, how differently this death on a cross is looked on. Here it is viewed as something to be gloried in, a fact full of divine significance in which we see as in no other fact of human history the length of God's love to sinful men. 'God forbid that I should glory,' says Paul the Christian Apostle, 'save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Gal 6¹⁴). 'Christ crucified,' he says again, 'the power of God, and the wisdom of God' (1 Co 1^{23f.}). The Cross of Jesus Christ, that is to say, is viewed by the Apostle as a fact of divine saving significance, the *crux* of the gospel for a world of sin.

1. So it was, it would seem, that it was viewed by Jesus Himself, so far as we have any authentic record of Jesus' own teaching as to the significance of His death. There is indeed in the Gospel records much less of explicit and definite teaching on this matter from Jesus' own lips than we could have wished. But we have to remember in this connexion the truth indicated by Dr. Dale of Birmingham when he said that 'Jesus came not to preach the gospel, but that there might be a gospel to preach,' and that the true significance of His death could be properly appreciated only after

the event had taken place and through the experience of its saving power in the lives of His followers. Yet one or two sayings of Jesus Himself have come down to us which indicate the direction at least in which Jesus pointed His disciples for a true understanding of the fact. Two sayings in particular, both recorded in the Synoptics and both acknowledged by most scholars to be genuine authentic sayings of our Lord. The first is the 'ransom' saying which appears identically in Mk 10⁴⁵ and Mt 20²⁸: 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom (λύτρον) for many.' Now the mistake has often been made to attempt to get a formal doctrine of the Atonement out of the word 'ransom,' a word which, as A. B. Bruce has said, itself suggests a problem rather than a solution (see *E.G.T.* on Mt 20²⁸). The Greek noun so translated comes from a verb which simply means 'to deliver' or 'to liberate,' and, as it has been said, 'It is our wisdom not to narrow the conception, but to leave it something of the elusive depth-greatness it must have had for (Jesus) Himself. By a ransom Jesus may well have meant, in broad but divinely impassioned ways, that He gave His life to *liberate* men from all to which they were enslaved.'¹ In what sense according to Jesus Himself He gave His life to 'liberate' or 'deliver' men, what kind of deliverance or liberation it was, this is more explicitly indicated in the second of the two sayings referred to, also appearing identically in Mark and Matthew, the saying recorded as spoken by Jesus at the institution of the Eucharist, namely, 'This (cup) is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many' (Mk 14²⁴, Mt 26²⁸). Here the salient point is the reference to a new covenant, and a covenant made in blood or ratified through blood, with its primary blessing, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah (31³¹⁻³⁴) which Jesus probably had in mind, of the forgiveness of sins and the establishment of a new fellowship with God—as Matthew adds, though the words are probably not authentic as coming from Jesus' own lips, 'for, or unto, the remission of sins (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν).' Here, then, in these two sayings of Jesus we have His death connected with deliverance or liberation of men from sin and restoration to fellowship with God. In what precise way Jesus connected His death with deliverance or liberation from sin and from alienation to God, we may not indeed be able to say; we do

not possess the data sufficient for forming a definite or certain judgment. But at least to deny that Jesus Himself attached vicarious significance to His death, to deny the connexion in Jesus' own thought between His death and man's deliverance or liberation from sin, would seem to be contrary not only to the two sayings specified but to the general indications of the Gospel narratives. There is ample evidence in the Gospels that Jesus in His references to His own death had in mind the picture of the vicarious and redeeming suffering of the servant of the Lord in Is 53.

2. When we come to the Apostolic writings, in particular to the writings of Paul, we find a much more developed and explicit presentation of the divine saving significance of Jesus' life and death than any indicated in the recorded teaching of Jesus Himself. But the direction along which he goes in his interpretation is the same as that already indicated by Jesus Himself, though he goes much farther in the matter of distance. The terms used by Paul in his different writings to represent or express the inmost meaning of Jesus' death are such as these: 'ransom' or 'redemption' (ἀπολύτρωσις, e.g. Gal 3¹³, 'Christ ransomed us from the curse of the law'); 'justification' or 'acquittal' (δικαίωσις, e.g. Ro 3²⁴, 'justified freely by his grace through the ransom provided in Christ Jesus'); 'propitiation' (ἱλαστήριον, in particular Ro 3²⁵, 'whom God set forth to be a propitiation, or a means of propitiation, by his blood, through faith, for the demonstration of his righteousness') (εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς διακαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ); 'reconciliation' (καταλλάγή, e.g. Ro 5¹¹, 'we joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have received our reconciliation').

Now, as Adolf Deissmann has pointed out,² these are all figures of speech or metaphors native to the civilization of the Jewish and Hellenic world in which Paul lived. The metaphor or figure of speech behind the term 'ransom' is that of the liberation or emancipation of the slave by purchase; behind 'justification' is that of the acquittal of an accused person in a court of law; behind 'propitiation' is that of a votive gift or offering with expiatory value; and behind 'reconciliation' is that of an enemy being conciliated or appeased. These metaphors or figures of speech were taken up by Paul and employed to express or intellectually interpret a marvellous new experience into which he had come through the life and death and resurrection of Jesus. And just because they are

¹ Professor H. R. Mackintosh, in *The Hibbert Journal*, April 1920, p. 607, in a review of Rashdall's Bampton Lectures, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*.

² In *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, 207 ff.

metaphors or figures of speech, they will, as Deissmann suggests, be done proper right by 'the less we petrify them into dogmatic statements and the more we see them as expressions of living religion.' That is to say, the important thing, the thing of primary importance, in Paul's varied formulations of the saving or atoning significance of Christ's life and death is not the intellectual or symbolic interpretation or formulation, but the religious experience back of the formulation, the experience which Paul sought to interpret by means of the various figures or metaphors referred to. When we ask what this experience was, the answer is that it was the experience of being brought into new saving fellowship with God through a crucified but now risen living Saviour and Lord, leading Him to find in the Cross as interpreted through the Resurrection and His post-resurrection working the very 'power of God unto salvation,' or in Moffatt's translation 'God's saving power' (Ro 1⁶). This was the vital experience which found varied intellectual expression in his different formulations, no one of which formulations he felt was fully adequate (though they had different degrees of adequacy)—no nor, Paul himself would say, all taken together, for the love of God expressed in Jesus Christ and especially in His Cross was, he said, 'a love which passeth knowledge' (Eph 3¹⁹).

III.

When we ask in what did this 'saving power' of Christ's death, as the culminating expression of His life, consist, the answer both of the New Testament and of Christian experience generally through the ages is twofold.

First.—The Cross of Christ reveals and condemns man's sin as nothing else does. In it we see as nowhere else what sin in its essence is. Jesus came to reveal God, and to reveal God as love. This He did not merely by His teaching but by His life, as a life controlled by Father-love, the essence of which is giving itself for others. 'He pleased not himself.' He denied Himself; He sacrificed Himself, ever seeking the least and the lowest and the lost. In doing so, He was misunderstood, despised, rejected, forsaken, crucified. And in Christ's Cross we see sin revealed and exposed. We see it not merely as a breach of God's law, but as an outrage upon God's holy love—we see it indeed as decide. Thus seen the death of Jesus has worked out as nothing else in history to condemn sin, and to induce in the sinner that 'godly sorrow which leadeth to repentance.'

Second.—The Cross of Christ reveals the length to which divine love went in seeking to win back and redeem sinful men. It is the revelation of divine love persisting in the face of sin at its worst. There as nowhere else we see the unveiling of the heart of God to man. 'The veil of the temple,' says Matthew, the Jewish Evangelist, 'was rent in twain from the top to the bottom,' as Jesus hung upon the Cross. That was a natural Jewish pictorial or figurative way of saying that in the death of Jesus we see the great and final disclosure of God's heart and God's love. 'God proveth His love towards us,' says the Gentile Apostle, 'in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us' (Ro 5⁸).

The length of this love in contact with man's sin, what was involved in it, is what so-called 'theories of the Atonement' attempt to explain. And in the New Testament itself, even, as we have seen, within the writings of the same author, there are different theories of the Atonement, different attempts to express the saving significance of the fact. But no theory of the Atonement is fully adequate; no, nor all taken together. The different formulations are so many varied attempts to give intellectual expression to a marvellous experience which has come to men through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ—an experience which to fully understand and explain we need to be God Himself or Christ Himself. And here it may be noted as significant that there is no one definite theory of the Atonement expressed in any of the great historic creeds of the Church. Indeed, there has been far more variation in the Church's teaching on this subject than on other Christian doctrines such as the Incarnation or the Trinity. Dean Rashdall in *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* has stressed the significance of this fact. 'The doctrine of the atonement has never been defined by any Creed or "general" Council of the Church. . . . The Apostles' Creed says literally nothing about it; the Creed commonly called "Nicene" or "Constantinopolitan" confines itself to the bare statements that the Son of God "for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven" and that He was crucified "for us." No Council that can possibly claim ecumenical authority has ever gone beyond such simple statements; and, if we look at the whole course of development from the New Testament to the end of the scholastic period, there is no subject upon which less of a *consensus patrum* can be alleged than on the question, "In what sense and for what reason can Christ be said to have died for us?"' (Preface, p. ix). But amid this variety or diversity in theory or

doctrine there is agreement as to the properly religious significance of the fact, namely, that through this death we are made nigh unto God, 'made nigh unto God through the death of the Cross.' And this properly religious or spiritual evaluation of the fact is the fact of primary importance; theories of interpretation and attempts at an intellectual construction of the fact are secondary. Our faith does not rest upon a theory but upon a fact.

Not indeed that we can rest in the fact simply, without some interpretation or theory of the fact. As rational beings, called to serve God with our minds as well as with our hearts and lives, we inevitably seek to set our Christian experience and religious evaluation of the fact of Christ's death in intelligible relations with the rest of our knowledge of God and man. But the fact of first essentiality and importance is our experience of and conviction as to the religious significance of the fact. Just as in the matter of the sun's relation-

ship to the earth, the important thing is the sun's life and heat which blessed men before there were any theories about or explanations of the sun's action. We value our scientific theories and explanations; but our experience of the sun, and of the sun's benefits, is the first thing, and men had this practical experience before they developed any theory of the 'how' of the experience, and this experience will abide while theories come and go. 'How this man opened mine eyes, I know not. One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.' So in the matter before us, brought to this test of experience, what we have in the Cross of Jesus Christ is the meeting-point of the two great ultimate facts of human history, man's sin and God's love, and God's love triumphing over man's sin.

O love of God! O sin of man!

In this dread act your strength is tried,

And victory remains with love:

Jesus, our Lord, is crucified!

Why 'Son of David'?

BY THE REVEREND ERIC F. F. BISHOP, NEWMAN SCHOOL OF MISSIONS, THABOR, JERUSALEM.

HAVE we assumed too readily the Messianic significance of the phrase 'Son of David,' without asking the reason why? We meet the words in the Litany, where the Sarum Use read *Fili Dei Vivi*. But there is ample evidence for the occurrence of *Jesu fili David, miserere*, in books of mediæval devotion.¹ The New Testament authority must be the story of Bartimæus and similar episodes in the Gospels.² In the Jericho incident Jesus is approached with the words, 'Son of David, Jesus, have mercy on me.' Luke has 'Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me.' Matthew omits 'Jesus,' but in some MSS 'Lord' occurs. In Mark and Luke the healing of the blind man in Jericho furnishes the first instance of our Lord being addressed in this way. Later, at the Triumphal Entry, He is welcomed as ushering in the 'coming Kingdom of our Father David,' not as Himself 'Son of David.'³ Luke has no reference to David, preferring, perhaps, to interpret the

shouting of the crowds as revealing the universal Kingship of Jesus, with the resultant blessings of peace and glory, as well as bringing the acclamation of the pilgrims into line with the angelic song at the Nativity.⁴ Matthew does have the words 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' but, when Jesus enters the city and people ask who He is, the crowd replies, 'This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee.'⁵ Entering Jerusalem with the crowd, He belongs to them. On this passage Dalman writes:

'Wellhausen rightly supposes that the procession on Palm Sunday did not acquire its pronounced Messianic colouring till a later period. The Teacher and Miracle-worker from Nazareth was then welcomed with jubilation. . . . Of the entry of the King . . . few will have thought.'⁶

Whatever view was taken by the authorities of the Triumphal Entry, our Lord was furnished with the atmosphere for His question concerning the sonship of the Messiah: 'How do the scribes say

¹ Evan Daniel, *The Prayer-Book: Its History, etc.*, 186.

² Mk 10⁴⁶, Lk 18³⁵, Mt 20³⁰ 9²⁷.

³ Mk 11¹⁰.

⁴ Lk 19³⁸.

⁵ Mt 21⁹, 10, 15.

⁶ G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 222.

that the Messiah is "Son of David"? So Mark; while Matthew makes the argument more explicit with his deeper interest in the words as Messianic. Can there be doubt that our Lord in this Temple scene did take the opportunity offered twice in recent days to bring the matter of Davidic sonship to the fore? Says Dalman again:

'Jesus showed that a Davidic descent, according to the flesh, was not an essential attribute of the Messiah. . . . It follows, consequently, that it was in no sense the question of derivation from David that caused Him to turn to the subject of the Messiah.'¹

May not our Lord then, however, have given to the phrase a Messianic flavour? It is not until the second century that the phrase becomes common in Jewish literature for a synonym of the Messiah, although the first occurrence is in the Psalms of Solomon.² It is surely right to ask, then, whether the words were full of Messianic content on the lips of Bartimæus, even if Matthew is justified in reading back the later meaning of the term on the lips of the crowd. When our Lord accepted the title, was it offered by those for whom 'Messiah' and 'Son of David' were alternative? May it not have been the early Christians who made the connexion with Old Testament texts, so far as He was concerned? Was it Christian genius in the wake of the genius of Jesus, which clinched the deeper meanings of the phrase?

Outside the Gospels, His Davidic descent is 'attested in various parts of the New Testament.' 'It is certain that this Messianic title would not have been ascribed to Him had it been believed that He did not satisfy the genealogical conditions implied by the name.'³ But this was later history. The Gospels witness the fact that Joseph was a 'son of David.' But if Jesus was so addressed *in His lifetime* in Galilee, in Judea and even outside the confines of Palestine proper, was it by people who felt that He satisfied the 'genealogical conditions,' or other conditions connoted for them by the phrase 'Son of David'?

The references to the Old Testament, usually adduced as showing that Christ was to come of the seed of David, are somewhat scanty. All seem to go back to 2 S 7¹², which in the first instance obviously refers to Solomon. Perhaps, then, with the Old Testament in view, it is legitimate to renew the question of the Master in the Temple Area, overlooking the Zion of David, 'How say

the scribes that the Messiah is David's Son'? How does any one come to say it? Ps 89^{3,4} and Mic 5³ require careful interpretation for bearing the whole weight of authority, even when in common with other verses, this is derived from 2 S 7¹². The scribes took the Mican passage according to Mt 2^{4ff.} to indicate that the Messiah should come from Bethlehem; but there is nothing in Matthew to show that Bethlehem was the city of David. It is Luke who calls attention to this, holding in common with Matthew that Joseph was of the house and lineage of David.⁴ But this does not constitute a reason for Jesus being accosted as 'Son of David' any more than do the references in St. Paul to His being of the seed of David.⁵ Our actual phrase is confined to the Synoptics.

So far as Rabbinic exegesis is concerned, 'the Messianic interpretation of Ps 110 is never found in Rabbinic literature until the second half of the second century.'⁶ Instead, the interpretation was applied to Abraham. May it have been that the breach between Judaism and Christianity forced a difference in exegesis? Or is it possible that Christian exegesis influenced Jewish? And a stage further back may it have been this scene in the Temple Area which in turn influenced early Christian study of and interest in the Old Testament in this connexion?

In Mark and Luke the phrase occurs only in passages which come towards the close of the ministry, at Jericho on the lips of the blind man and when Jesus put His question about scribal interpretation. In Matthew there are other instances. The first is in 9²⁷, when the two (other) blind men were healed in response to a similar cry. This may be parallel to the story in Mk 8^{22ff.} recorded as taking place at Bethsaida. If this be the case, which is the first instance in Mark of blindness being healed by our Lord, Matthew has left out nearly all the means used in effecting the cure, contenting himself with the last only. This was laying His hand on the man, but was preceded according to Mark by Jesus taking him by the hand, leading him outside the town and spitting on his eyes. It is perhaps worth noting that the saliva of a holy person is still regarded by simple folk in Palestine as possessed of healing properties. In Matthew, although our Lord healed the two with the command to be silent, we read that as they left Him on that occasion a deaf-mute was

¹ *Op cit.*, 319.

² Pss Sol. 17²³.

³ *Op. cit.*, 319, where there is a list of second-century references.

⁴ Lk 2⁴, Mt 1²⁰; cf. Jn 7⁴².

⁵ Ro 1³, 2 Ti 2⁸; cf. Ac 13²⁸. There are four references in Ignatius.

⁶ *Vide* Creed on Lk 20⁴¹.

brought, who was also possessed by a demon. Matthew simply says that the demon was cast out and the deaf-mute began to speak. May we not reasonably wonder whether the friends of the latter on this occasion may not have heard the blind men coming up to Jesus 'in the house' and claiming His help on the ground that He was 'Son of David'? McNeile remarks that here (as in 20³⁰) 'it may have been only a form of polite address.'¹

It is a curious thing that the healing of a deaf-mute in Mark follows the healing of the demoniac daughter of the Syrophenician woman, who, according to the Matthean account, also acclaimed Jesus as the 'Son of David.' Here most of all we should like to know why it was that 'the title came naturally to the lips of those who sought Jesus' aid in their great distress'? The next record in the first Gospel, too, is of the healing of many sick people, who were cast at His feet—among them deaf-mutes. Mark, however, is again very specific over the cure-method, for Jesus takes the man off by himself, puts His fingers as far as ever He can into the patient's ears, and having spat (probably as a sign that the devil was coming out), He touched the man's tongue.² But the cure was not finished without the glance heavenwards, the deep sigh and the imperative ἐφφαθά, a word requiring a lot of lip movement, all of which actions the deaf-mute with the one faculty of sight would understand.

The other occasion in Matthew where the phrase occurs is 12^{28ff.} There is a parallel in Luke.³ In both Gospels the Beelzebub controversy is introduced with the healing of a demoniac, who was also a deaf-mute and (according to Matthew) blind into the bargain. It would seem to be one of the few anecdotes in 'Q,' but as necessary an introduction to the material that follows as is the healing of the centurion's servant to the words of our Lord on that occasion. But Matthew has an extra point. After the healing affecting one of the worst cases ever brought to Him, 'the crowds were all amazed and began to say, Is not this the Son of David?' The Pharisees put the cure down to Beelzebub. Our Lord pointed out the preposterousness of their explanation, clinching His argument in Mark with the claim that through His acting thus *the kingdom of Satan was being brought to an end*, while in Matthew and Luke the Kingdom of God was brought near. The whole subject was

sufficiently important to find a place in Mark and 'Q.' If the sons of the Pharisees could effect cures to the satisfaction of all concerned, how much more one who was hailed by the populace as 'Son of David'!

This scene ends the group of Gospel stories in which people of their own volition accost Christ as 'Son of David.' Right up to the Triumphal Entry, those who call Jesus by this title are confined to blind people (the only case in Mark and Luke confirming this) and to a distracted mother—non-Jewish, but living near the boundaries of Palestine—with a demoniac daughter, plus the acclamation of the crowd in Galilee after the remarkable cure of a blind deaf-mute. This popular use is surely significant. It is the idea of the crowds; or the suggestion is passed on to those who would not otherwise have had the opportunity of knowing about Jesus. The blind men hear of Him and His healing powers and straight away call Him 'Son of David.' Jesus withdraws to Tyre and Sidon; and, in a context where it looks as if Matthew may have drawn on a source other than Mark, He is appealed to at once by this name to save a maniac child. In close connexion with two of the healings of blind people that of deaf-mutes is recorded, and in one case it is hard not to draw the deduction of collusion between the two incidents. Finally, in Matthew, the Lord is hailed three times as 'Son of David,' once in Galilee, twice in Judea. In the first case it was directly due to a cure; in the second in circumstances in which Mark, too, has a reference to David; the third is in the Temple Area on the lips of children.⁴ If the phrase was not Messianic in Jerusalem any more than it was in Galilee or Syria, there is no need to adopt Wellhausen's suggestion!⁵

If, however, the title was natural to folk who wanted Jesus to help them as only He could, why should it be this title? When blind men use it and a foreign mother, we need to find the reason. Does 'Messianic' really meet the facts? In the Old Testament the title is chiefly borne by Solomon, the tenth son of David; but the son *par excellence*, who captured (if perhaps in a less degree than his father) the imagination of Palestine. Outside Jewry, too, he seems to have had a wide circle of influence. He was known beyond the confines of his own kingdom more even after his death than in his life. This may have been due in part to the Exile. He is still a personality embedded in the folklore of the Near East. If Josephus could describe him as a sorcerer, Muhammad also knew all

¹ *Commentary on Matthew*, ad loc.

² Cf. P. L. Couchoud, 'Notes sur le texte de St. Marc,' etc., in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1934.

³ Lk 11^{14f.}

⁴ Mt 21¹⁵.

⁵ Dalman, *op. cit.*, 222.

about him 'as granted command over men and angels and spirits. . . . Satan and his myrmidons were forced to obey his orders.'¹ In the article on 'Solomon' in Hastings' *Dictionary* we read that already in Josephus's time Solomon's sorcery was a 'generally accepted belief among the Jews and probably was not confined to them. It is especially as a sorcerer and lord over the elements, animals, *aphreets* and *jinn*, that he is renowned in the East. The Oriental imagination has run riot in the invention of legends regarding him.'² The 'Thousand and One Nights' has references to *Sulaiman ibn Dawud*.³ Over Arabic-speaking countries he is still known as *Sulaiman al-Hakim* or the wise—the word in common use for 'doctor.' There is no doubt that he found a permanent place in Palestinian folklore and in that of the surrounding countries. Is it possible to find in this fact part of the reason why the crowds and others in Palestine in our Lord's day gave Him the title of 'Son of David'? What He did was the sort of thing to the unenlightened and simple that *Solomon ben Dawid* was expected to do. The prevalence of the same attitude towards the *δαίμονια* or *jinn* (in the Arabic world yet the man who is mad is called *majnun*) throughout Western Asia might help to explain the naturalness of the title on the lips of a non-Jewess.

Now Solomon after his death found a place considerably farther afield than Syria. Eastwards in Malaysia, westwards in Southern Spain, he made himself felt. Muslim legend says that he was able to control the *jinn* with a ring; but it may only be a coincidence that the *Aphreeta*, who stole his ring, was punished for the offence by being shut up in a *Qomqom* and flung into the sea!⁴ In another land bordering on Palestine, our Lord healed the Gerasene demoniac, where one result was that the demons entered into the swine, which perished in the waters.⁵ Dead pigs might be no place for demons, but the main thing was that they had gone into the waters whence there was no return.⁶

May not part of the facts be that our Lord in

¹ Geiger, *Judaism and Islam*, 46 f.; cf. Qur'an 21⁷⁸ *et passim*.

² H.D.B. iv. 560. *Vide* also articles in E.R.E., *Jewish Encyclopedia*, and *Encyclopedia of Islam*.

³ E.g. in Story of Fisherman and Jinni.

⁴ *Vide* E. Westermarck, *Ritual and Belief in Morocco*, 351 f.

⁵ For 'Qarina,' or 'Familiar Demon,' *vide* S. M. Zwemer, *Animism in Islam*, ch. vi. Solomon's name is still connected with formulæ relating to the 'Qarina.'

⁶ Luke (8³¹) calls it the 'abyss.'

accepting for Himself the popular use of the phrase 'Son of David' gave it a more Messianic turn than it had before? In Him two lines of thought or hope converged. The Lukan genealogy does not trace His descent through Solomon but Nathan, who is mentioned three times in the Old Testament immediately before Solomon in the lists of the sons of David. It is worth noting that in Mark, Bartimæus calls Jesus 'Son of David' before giving Him His own name. Luke has it the other way round, making the form of address more natural, especially so if he did not understand the full significance. Hence, would there not seem to have been a special meaning attaching to the term in the mind of Bartimæus? It was the 'Son of David' who could restore his sight. To Jesus as such he made his request. Luke says that he wanted to know what the procession was all about; and he had presumably heard of the works of Jesus before. Consequently he spoke to our Lord in the best and most reverential way he knew. If any one could do these things which He did, for Nicodemus it was because God was with Him—for Bartimæus and others like him, because He must be the 'Son of David.' The blind man was in no way put out by the many who wanted him to be quiet. Luke says these people were in the van of the procession, and their efforts at silencing the blind man only made him shout the more, so that Jesus heard him, and had him brought to Him (once more outside the city proper). And Bartimæus surely pulled on his garment as he jumped up to meet a great man.⁷ Blind people are very sensitive to propriety. Still more interesting is it that Bartimæus followed Him in the way, that led up to Jerusalem and the fuller revelation of the identity of the 'Son of David.' The last man according to our records to have spoken to Him in this way finds himself in the crowd that brings Jesus to usher in the Kingdom of 'our father David.' The stage was set for a 'Son of David' to prove Himself 'greater than Solomon,' no matter the latter's place in the folklore of the nations of Western Asia at the time.

After all, our Lord had been doing the things expected of Solomon, the 'Son of David'—works of mercy and constructive kindness that He was prepared to combine with ideas of Messiahship as against the other Messianic concepts of power and military prowess. He had some foundation for this conception, when after being 'proved with hard questions' He took His turn in asking them. The time had come for Him to 'insinuate His

⁷ So Sin^{37c}. Aeth., 565.

Messianic claims.' There was something to substantiate them, even if the proofs were not literary and academic. And must not our Lord have been *au fait* with the folklore of the land and the ideas of ordinary people just as He was versed in the Old Testament Scriptures? If we may judge at all from the history of a thousand years and more over these countries, it is the influence of tradition and legend embodied in the folklore of the people that has had a far more potent influence over ordinary men and women than the written word. *Hadith*¹ for many a year has meant more than the *Qur'an* in the daily thought and routine of the inhabitants of these lands, especially the unsophisticated—those who do not know the Law. So when the day came in His teaching for Jesus to ask His question as to how it was that the scribes said that the Messiah was David's Son, the authorities well knew the basis of the claim He was putting forward—those works of love and mercy which had relieved the sufferers of their 'plagues,' and captivated the imagination of the common people. He had even borne their sicknesses to the extent of entering into their thoughts with regard to the cause and origin; so that in

¹ i.e. Tradition.

what He did for them, they saw the 'Son of David.'² The issue was practical rather than academic. He was a 'Son of David' because He was a 'man after God's own heart,' and as such was set upon the throne of His father, David. He 'went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil.' This was still Peter's argument at Cæsarea.³ He is the Messiah pre-eminently because He is the Conqueror of all men's fears. It is 'Jesus in the experience of men' that counts and counted, not the academic theorizing of the scribes. If, too, it was the testimony of the blind and demon-ridden in the first century that He was 'Son of David,' not because the Scriptures seemed to suggest so, but because He did the things they knew the 'Son of David' would, is it not the testimony of the Church in the mission field as well—very often in not entirely dissimilar circumstances? In the last analysis do we not individually and collectively believe in Jesus, because of the difference He has made?

² Or, as Isaiah put it: 'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped . . . and the tongue of the dumb shall sing' (35⁶; cf. 29¹⁸).

³ Ac 10^{38, 39}.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'L' for Learner.

By THE REVEREND H. L. PICKEN, RHOS-ON-SEA.

' . . . ye are my disciples . . . '—Jn 13³⁵.

THOSE of you who are interested in motors, will have noticed that some of the cars recently, just a few, have a big letter 'L' fixed close to their registration number.

'What is that letter "L" for, Daddy?' asked a small boy, as his father was about to overtake a car that was so marked. 'It means Learner,' replied Daddy. 'The driver is learning, you see, and not until he knows how to drive properly and has passed his test will he get his licence. In the meantime he must show a Learner's Badge on his car.' After that every car they passed, that had an L on it, John would shout, 'Look out, Daddy, here's a silly old Learner.'

Next morning they were talking of that 'L' again, and the father explained that really everybody was a Learner. 'But, Daddy, you are not a Learner,' John protested. 'Oh yes, I am, but it has nothing to do with motor cars. I am learning to take charge of and to drive something far more important than motors.' 'What is it, Daddy?' 'My life, John.'

'You know, when Jesus started His Ministry He chose some friends to be with Him that He might teach them. They were called disciples, that means learners. I'm one of His learners or disciples, John, and proud to be so. Never despise any one who is learning, whether it is to drive a motor car, to build a house, or to be like Jesus. It isn't only beginners who have to learn. With everything you must go on learning, learning, and learning, however old you may be or however long you have been at it.'

'What does he have to learn, Daddy? I mean the

man who was driving the motor.' 'Oh, many things. I'll tell you the chief.

'First, he has to learn to steer, to keep his eye on the road, and not to wobble about or to obstruct other traffic. That is one of the things I am still having to learn, as a disciple of Jesus—to steer my life. You remember the sad accident which happened last month in Switzerland when the young Queen of the Belgians was killed. She was being driven by her husband, King Leopold, in a fast-moving car, along the road by the side of the lake of Lucerne, and for a moment he took his eye off the road to glance at the route map Queen Astrid was holding, and at that moment the car left the road and crashed into a tree.

'It's just the same on the journey of life. To keep a straight and steady course on the Christian path the disciple must give himself entirely to it. On all sides there are distractions—selfish pleasures and ambitions, frivolities of one sort or another, to lure the unwary out of the path. Yes, keep your mind on the job and your eye on the road is equally good advice to the traveller on the Christian path and to the learner-motorist.

'Then, again, the motorist must learn to stop his car at any moment and in any place. A sudden emergency arises, a boy dashes into the road after a ball straight in front of the car, and the driver must be able to stop immediately.

'On the journey of life we must be ready for all emergencies. All sorts of dangers are to be met with. There are temptations which crop up just as suddenly as any child dashing into the road. There are dangers of all sorts like awkward bends or steep hills, and we must be able to stop; to stop if we are tempted to wrong-doing, to pull up if we find we are going fast downhill into loose ways of talking, and behaving, acting foolishly and selfishly.

'Yes, to be able to stop is most important, to stop in an emergency, otherwise you will certainly run into disaster.

'There are very many other things that the motorist has to learn. You can think of them yourself, John; but in case you forget it, I'll just mention this one and perhaps the most important—to obey the rules of the road. If he doesn't know and obey the rules, well, you know what would happen, he would be a danger to everybody and would cause not only trouble and confusion, but accidents.

'He travels on the King's highway, the road is not his, but the King's. He can go where he pleases, but he must obey the rules. So that he shall know these rules the King's Minister for

Transport has written a little book called "The Highway Code," in which the rules are set out, and has sent a copy to every house in the country. You've seen it, John, it's that little blue book with pictures of the policeman controlling traffic.

'And so, too, the Christian disciple must learn to obey the rules of the road which he travels, for it also is the King's highway—the King of kings—and it leads to the King's country. He too has a "Highway Code," compiled by the King's ministers—yes, of course, the Bible. Mr. Hore-Belisha says his Code "is the standard of conduct for the road," and that is exactly what the Bible is—"the standard of conduct for the road," that is why I read mine every day.

'Yes, "I" for Learner. Always be proud to be one of Jesus' learners.'

The Tight-Rope Walker.

BY THE REVEREND T. B. STEWART THOMSON,
M.C., B.D., EDINBURGH.

'Hold up my goings in thy paths, that my footsteps slip not.'—Ps 17⁵.

The other day I took my children to the circus. Perhaps it would be more honest to say that, like many parents there, I had made the children an excuse to renew my own youth—just as when Father gives you a train and rails for your birthday he seems to spend most of the evening playing with them himself!

It was a good circus. There were all the old favourites: clowns and beautiful ladies jumping through hoops, prancing horses and performing elephants, a tamer of wild animals, and 'the man on the flying trapeze.' But I think the turn which attracted me most was a rather wonderful tight-rope walker, a young Hindu who performed many marvellous and daring feats on the wire.

The secret of that kind of thing lies, of course, almost entirely in acquiring a sense of *balance*. And it's not easy; though once you have it, it seems to come quite naturally, without your having to think about it at all. When you were a baby it took you a long time to stand up and walk about without tumbling over. Later on, when you were learning to ride a bicycle, you took many tosses in the dust. The first thing an airman has to do when training to fly, is to gain his balance. When that is done, everything else becomes quite simple.

Clever men who have studied the human body tell us that the *ears* have a lot to do with balance. That sounds rather funny, doesn't it? You see

inside the ear are three little canals full of fluid, which act like spirit-levels. As the liquid tilts to one side or the other, a message is at once carried up to the brain, which causes the muscles to make the proper adjustments in order to keep the body at a proper level. When, through disease, these canals are destroyed, the man sprawls helplessly. So wonderfully is our body made by God.

The other things chiefly used in keeping balance are the *eyes*. They tell us our position in relation to objects round about us, and so keep us straight and upright. If you try standing very still, with your eyes tightly shut, you will find that gradually your body will begin to sway about just a little. *You* may not perhaps notice it, but others will. A drunk man reels about, and often falls down, because his eyes can't focus properly and his muscles are not under control—his brain is partly paralysed. How wrong and silly it is for people to make fools of themselves in this way!

The Christian way of life may be compared to a tight-rope. It is not easy to go straight, without falling down on one side or the other. It is a 'narrow way' that leads to life eternal. But if we use our *ears* to listen to the voice of God, as He speaks to us through His Spirit, and keep our *eyes* fixed upon Jesus, we shall be quite safe. That is what the psalmist means, when he says: 'Hold up my goings in thy paths, that my footsteps slip not.'

The Peace Army.

BY THE REVEREND LESLIE F. SPENCER, GUISELEY.

'By thy words thou shalt be justified.'—Mt 12³⁷.

The other day I came across a sentence in a book that recalled memories of my boyhood days. It was, 'Give me twenty-six lead soldiers and I will conquer the world.'

How I loved my toy soldiers, with the hearthrug as a battlefield, the castle in the background, with its drawbridge and moat. I was the General in command, and had both cavalry and infantry regiments at my disposal. Many a battle was fought and won on that hearthrug, with struck matches as ammunition. Many a hero's medal adorned my imaginary tunic. Many a time did I conquer the world with less than twenty-six lead soldiers.

But since those days, when I grew up into the real world, and left the world of make-believe behind, I made a most important discovery. I discovered that millions of live soldiers cannot conquer the world. No one can win a real victory

with soldiers and guns and ammunition. Alexander the Great and Napoleon had huge armies. They led them from victory to victory. But the time came when all that had been gained was lost. And the Great War which ended about the time many of you were born didn't result in any one conquering the world.

What, then, can conquer the world? 'Twenty-six lead soldiers.' You know what those are. The book in which I saw this sentence was a book on printing. It meant the twenty-six lead pieces, each moulded into a letter of the alphabet. These letters go to form every word that can be made in our English language. Twenty-six letters used in different combinations make every possible word in every possible sentence. Out of them you can make ugly and hurtful words that will lead to enmity, or you can make good and helpful ones that will make and keep friendships.

You remember reading of the good monk Gregory in the Market-place at Rome. How he saw some fair-haired slave youths and asked who they were. 'Angles,' was the reply. The word not only told whence they came, but also indicated that they belonged to a warlike race. But Gregory, using the same letters in a different combination, replied, 'not Angles, but angels,' and later, when he became Bishop of Rome, he fulfilled the vow he then made of sending missionaries to their country. Don't you think that was a better way of using letters, to make a good word with a peaceful meaning?

Or look at our English Bible. It only took these twenty-six letters to make that. And if only people would read it carefully and base their lives upon its great truths the world would be more quickly conquered.

Whenever we speak or read or write, all our words are made out of these same twenty-six letters. If we will use them aright we can make our English language not only beautiful, but by it we can help to conquer the world for God and His purposes of good.

The Christian Year.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Quenching Question.

'What think ye of Christ?'—Mt 22⁴².

We are just emerging out of a somewhat self-satisfied and arrogant age, which had a way of tacitly assuming that it had discovered the right of man to ask questions. The scientist asked some new

and striking questions, and the very asking of them, even where they cannot yet be answered, has contributed to the well-being and efficiency of the race. The social reformer has been asking some loud and startling questions, and there is no saying when these will cease echoing; and pray God that some of them will never be silenced until they are answered. And in this new pride and power of questioning there were not a few who harboured a kind of resentment against the Church of Christ, more or less overt, because they imagined that she was anxious, not to mother, but to smother, the spirit of inquiry.

1. We cannot too often remind ourselves and everybody else that it was Jesus Christ who, among religious teachers, encouraged men to think for themselves. It was the lack of thought and imagination that the prophets of the Old Testament had recognized to be at the bottom of so much of the prevalent sin and misery. 'My people do not consider.' And, so far from suppressing inquiry and eager pursuit and research, it was a continual marvel to our Lord that men should be so supine. 'How is it that ye do not understand?' 'How think ye?' 'What shall it profit?' 'Why do ye not yourselves judge?' We are told that upon one occasion when a young man came to our Lord asking questions and answering them, Jesus gave him the very highest commendation. It was not when this young thinker answered piously, or replied in the kind of way that he might have thought would please our Lord, but when he answered *discreetly*—'put his mind to it,' as the Greek has it, that Jesus said to him, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' There spoke, not a servile lover of dogma, not a forger of chains and creeds, but the Pioneer, not only of our salvation, but of our intellectual liberty, of freedom of thought and freedom of speech, and the right of every man to judge for himself.

Lieutenant Simmonds, of Mansfield College, Oxford, before his death in action on the Somme, wrote: 'If Christ were not my strength I would commit suicide to-night. We must just wait in all penitence and humility before His Cross, seeking to hide nothing from Him, and fixing our soul's attention on that symbol of His strength, and that symbol of the suffering love of the Father. Then He will come to us (I speak because I know), and He will flood our life with the joy and peace of His Resurrection and glorification.'

There are some things that can wait; but not our personal attitude to *that*. This is the beginning of everything and the end of everything, the question

of our relationship to Jesus Christ. Not without reason did He call Himself the Alpha and the Omega—the A to Z—of life, for in terms of Him the whole story of life must be written, and the mystery of existence spelled out and reduced to reason.

2. 'What think ye of Christ?' We have scarcely recovered from our pleasure at the winsomeness and attractiveness of the Man who is so frank and open, when we are overcome with a feeling of awe of One who can afford to speak in this way. That gentleness is terrific. If He were to smite with the sword or to call down fire we would know where we were. If He would assert His authority and stop us in mid-career of our folly and sin, or our carelessness and casual indifference to His Church and Kingdom and commands! But He does not. Christ will not force Himself upon us. If the inhospitable Samaritans do not want Him, He punishes them in a far more terrible fashion than the disciples suggested. They were for calling down fire from heaven upon them. Jesus did something far more awful. He simply passed on and left them.

3. And so the asking of this old, old question again to-day reminds us in the third place that an hour will come when we shall never hear it asked again. It was at a comparatively late stage in their training that Jesus brought His disciples into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi, and there definitely asked them to make up their minds about Him. It was not enough that they should merely acquiesce in the current opinion about Him. 'Who do men say that the Son of man is?' was a question of importance for the historian. 'But whom say ye that I am?' was a question of life and death for the individual soul.

There comes a certain definite time or times when a man is brought face to face with the fact of Jesus Christ, and must give verdict upon Him. Usually there are three ways of dealing with so-called 'burning questions.' The question may not be a burning one for us, and we can afford to leave it unanswered. Or it may concern us, but we cannot bring ourselves to supply the right answer. Or we may answer it and settle the question once and for all. With this paramount question there are not three lines of treatment open, but only one. For even if we say we cannot decide, our non-committal is in itself an answer. For we are in the same case as that of a drowning man to whom some friendly bystander throws the life-line, and he replies that he cannot decide whether to seize it or not. He *has* decided in deciding not to decide. The coroner's inquest next day leaves no doubt of that.

That is the tragic turn, that so many believe that they can linger indefinitely in the parts of Cæsarea Philippi. But the spiritual faculty is the most delicate of all and the first to become blunted, as the rare blooms are the first to suffer in a vitiated atmosphere. We dare not tamper with it. There are scales used for measuring lead by the rough hundredweight. One might bang them with a sledge-hammer and make no impression. There are others so delicate that a hair suffices to tilt the beam, and the touch of a clumsy finger throws them out of gear. It was a heathen philosopher who said, 'I ought to take care that the eye of my soul does not become dim.' It was a greater who said, 'If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.'

4. 'What think ye of Christ?' Not only may our failure to answer that question go, but let us remember that *this question judges us*.

Everybody knows Dr. Johnson's wise reply to the man who thought fit to inform him that he was not a gentleman: 'Sir, you are no judge.' There comes a time when a man loses the ability to judge of spiritual things. In answering this momentous question as to the person and claims of Christ, we are thrown back upon all our faculties. It is not merely an affair of the intellect; it is a matter of a right heart also, and a sound will. On a summer day some years ago the *Glendale* was wrecked off the Mull of Kintyre. The circumstances were peculiar. The trustworthy captain knew every inch of the coast, and at first there seemed to be no explanation of the mysterious catastrophe. But at the inquiry it was found that a load of iron pillars which the vessel was carrying had been placed in too close proximity to the compass, and had deflected it. So a man may imagine that he is steering by the trustworthy light of reason and sound judgment. But all the while there is something in his life which nullifies the guiding of the compass.

If other questions are burning questions, this is the great quenching question. It silences all others, for it is itself the answer to everything. We all think that we have the right to make certain demands of Almighty God. We are ready with many questions, questions with a touch of complaint in them, with a note of self-excuse, with more than a hint of self-satisfaction. God is ready with His answer: 'What think ye of Christ?' That is His word, His last word. And silence falls at once upon all the questioners. After that, as we read, 'no one ventured to ask him any more questions.'¹

¹ H. L. Simpson, *The Nameless Longing*, 203.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Way of Life.

'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.'—Ps 119¹⁰⁶.

There are those to whom the Hundred and Nineteenth Psalm, the long psalm, seems a dull affair. Of these, some do not matter. They are of the type which regards all music as monotonous, which sees little difference between the best lines that Wordsworth ever wrote and the worst, who think of Shakespeare as a clever writer, and of the Alps as pretty scenery. Their condemnation, though it remains a tragedy after all the effort and goodwill that has been put into education, does not matter, except that it condemns themselves.

But there are some—in fact, there are very many—who would find the whole of the Hundred and Nineteenth Psalm much too long for them to use with any profit all at once. This is most reasonable. We all have only a certain amount of attention and power of concentration. And the psalm is in actual use in smaller portions, each portion long enough to convey an idea of the view of life which the whole psalm enshrines.

It is an alphabetical psalm. It has twenty-two stanzas, the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. Each one of the eight verses in the Aleph stanza begins with the letter Aleph, and so on. Every single verse in the whole psalm contains a mention of the Law of God, spoken of as either the law, or the commandment, or the word, or the statutes, or the judgments, or other term of that kind. It is thus an ingeniously constructed poem. But it is much more than that. It is a devout meditation on the Law of God. By this must not be understood merely the Mosaic Law. It is law in a wider sense. If an Englishman were described as being devoted to law and order, that would not of necessity mean only the statute law. The expression would mean a person who in general delights in an ordered, constitutional way of life, a person who thinks with satisfaction, even with enthusiasm, of the duty of individuals to take their place in a regular process, and of the strengthening of moral fibre which comes to them from such participation. So here. The law, or the commandment, or the way, or whatever term is used, means the will of God regarded as the general, universal guide of life.

The guide of life. All serious persons have some guide, within, without, or both. It is interesting every now and then to remember to what an extraordinary extent the natural instincts have

been subdued and held in reserve, or turned in another direction. We all have strong instincts—for example, self-preservation, sex, and so on. In any kind of civilization these are sternly directed. Circumstances, of course, help us. Our tendency to laziness is balanced by the necessity of earning a living. Other tendencies are checked by public opinion. But effort is also required. Thanks to our own efforts, and other causes, most of us achieve a reasonable degree of clean living, good citizenship, diligence, and other virtues. We hold ourselves in hand, and as a rule do not let go.

But then there comes, not exactly a frost. It is not as Wolsey said :

And, when he thinks, good easy man, full surely
His greatness is a-ripening, comes a frost,
A killing frost.

Sometimes it is just the opposite of that. There comes a time when, in the words of the Prophet Jeremiah, 'There is in my heart a burning fire.' Sometimes, to change the metaphor, the control slips, and we are carried away. Sometimes there is a sort of weakening, a crumpling up. There are indeed some who, having apparently no motive of religion, declare that they never, or hardly ever, crumple up. It appears that they have set their affections upon that which is right, and they attain what they desire. We may hazard the conjecture that very few of us find ourselves to be of that quality.

What, then, can we do? Here is an illustration from Rudolf Otto. In a Gothic cathedral a man who is technically proficient can see the principles of its construction and its characteristics of style. If, moreover, he has a practical eye, he can see how it could be restored or better adapted to its purpose. But there is another possibility. He may remain quietly in a corner and, as Otto puts it, 'experience' the cathedral in receptive contemplation. Even though it is half-ruined, or not yet finished, if he has the seeing eye he will be possessed of its essential idea. It will be revealed to him in its entirety and its unity, in its mystery and its sublimity; he will become aware of its real meaning.

The Psalmist is like that. We do not say that he has discovered the whole meaning of life. No finite mind could ever really do that. But he may perhaps be said to have discovered the *rhythm* of it, or to have discovered what there is behind it. In *The Nature of Belief* by Father D'Arcy, of Oxford, a distinguished Roman Catholic, we come across this sentence: 'The majority of men were never meant to be scholars or to overstrain their heads

with meditation on philosophy. They would do much better to meditate upon a Person, and, having committed their ways to His providence, to be shrewd and wide-awake and go about their lawful occasions.'

It is rather in this sense that the Psalmist found a satisfactory way of life. He rings the changes on his substantives, and he rings the changes on his verbs. He rules himself after God's word, he hides it within his heart. His eyes long sore for it, his soul breaks out for the fervent desire that it has always unto God's commandments. He is as glad of them as one that finds great spoils. Princes did sit and speak against him, but he had something more absorbing than the fear of that; he was occupied in the statutes of the Lord. The persecuting princes are waved away, for he was occupied. All the day long was his study in the Law. It was his comfort in his trouble. He even says, 'It is good for me that I have been in trouble: that I may learn thy statutes.' By it he is wiser than his enemies. He will walk at liberty, for he seeks God's commandments. Nay, he will do more than walk, he will run in the way of the Divine commandments; for God has set his heart at liberty.

In this seeming monotony lies hid an amazing wealth of experience. Every degree of strength and every variety of eagerness is represented—the zeal of youth without rashness, the maturity of age without immobility, the fervour of a prophet, the devotion of a saint, the patience of a pilgrim. Well might John Ruskin say, 'This Psalm has become of all the most precious to me in its overflowing and glorious passion of love for the law of God.'

There is for us all an individual life. From time to time this is in danger, when temptation comes. Where shall we find for both these lives what Matthew Arnold called 'an ever surer and surer stay'? From our own inherited and practised control of instincts, from our own intellectual discoveries, from our own aesthetic choice? These things are useful, and to a point they serve. But there come times when we discover that there is indeed an enemy 'who walketh about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour.' It is even more dangerous when we do not perceive it, when the forces of evil are encamped all round us, and we are the prisoners of mortals' chiefest enemy, false security. Most terrible of all is it when we know, but the force of resistance is all broken, and there is no desire for freedom.

And it is at these vital points, the point of

defenceless ignorance or, worse still, of base and sordid acquiescence, that the grace of God comes in. I can perhaps save myself from my enemies, but it takes God to save me from myself. The Psalmist saw the whole of life as an area of grace. Each single step he took was under the Divine Providence—his lying down and his rising up, his walking and his running. What is called the dignity of labour is a great idea; it ennobles the way in which most of us spend most of our waking hours. But the Psalmist knows an idea much more sublime than that—the dignity of life. Life for him has an interest, a romance, a consecration, a promise of worth-whileness, and at least of adequate success, because the Lord's word is a lantern unto his feet: and a light unto his path.¹

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christian Praise.

'Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord.'—Eph 5¹⁹ (R.V.).

1. When Christianity was first preached in the world, men were impressed by the astonishing cheerfulness which marked its professors. Yet the converts of the Apostles did not often possess the normal constituents of earthly happiness. They were humble folk, often indeed slaves: they had to work hard under hard conditions: they were ill-regarded by their neighbours who resented their refusal to conform to the customs and habits of pagan society: they were frowned upon by the authorities of Church and State who were suspicious of novelty and alarmed by every kind of nonconformity: they were sometimes subjected to barbarous ill-treatment: martyrdom was a frequent experience from the first. And yet they displayed a fortitude in trouble, a triumphant joy in affliction, a cheerfulness in the most depressing fortunes which exceeded even the Stoic's indifference to circumstance, and lifted these humble believers to a moral altitude which their contemporaries could neither reach nor understand. It is not uncommon now to hear Christianity spoken of as a religion of gloom, and contrasted in this respect with the paganism which it overcame. But such a contrast will not occur to the close student of Christian beginnings. He will rather agree with Dr. Glover that then Christians 'were the most essentially happy people of the day.'

2. The springs of this persistent joyfulness are not hard to discover. Christianity brought to its

sincere professors three pre-eminent boons, every one of which brought joy with it—a good conscience, a good hope, and the power of a good life. These are indeed the sources of the deepest human happiness. To be at peace with God, to know that beyond this visible life with its hardships and wrongs there is an eternal life into which here and now we may have entrance, to move in the world with the freedom and dignity of self-mastery—this is to be released from the heaviest burdens which weigh on the human spirit. On Bishop Westcott's grave in the Chapel of Auckland Castle is inscribed by his own direction the great Word of Christ, which gives the key to the enigma of Christian cheerfulness—'I came that they may have life.' Human life became a richer, greater thing when it was interpreted by Christ, inspired by Christ, governed by Christ, summed up in Christ.²

It is related that when Margaret Ethel Macdonald was dying she said to her husband, 'Let us praise God together for what has been. He has been very good to me, in giving me my work, my friends, and my faith. At the end of the day, I go gladly to Him for rest and shelter.'

Recently Canon Dick Sheppard took as the text for a speech to young people words from the Huguenot Bible, *Heureux les debonnaires*—'Blessed are not the meek, but the debonaire.' Speaking to a Pacifist group he begged them to be debonaire when they told the world they would not fight—to have humour and grace.

The ancient Irish hymn known as 'The Lorica of St. Patrick' is a typically Christian composition, filled with the happiness of a perfect 'Rest in the Lord.' It might fairly be described as a rhapsody on the words of St. Paul, 'To me to live is Christ.' It is meaningless to the non-Christian; it speaks the very thought of every genuine Christian:

Christ with me, Christ before me,
Christ behind me, Christ within me,
Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ at my right, Christ at my left,
Christ in the Fort,
Christ in the Chariot-seat,
Christ in the Ship.

3. 'Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.' The joyfulness of Christians could not but find expression in their worship. The Church as 'the true Israel' came into possession of a noble heritage. Its earliest hymn-book, and its best, was the Book of Psalms, which has never lost its primacy in Christian usage. Christians read into the Jewish

¹ S. C. Carpenter, *The House of Pilgrimage*, 165.

² H. H. Henson, *The Kingdom of God*, 62.

compositions new and nobler meanings of their own, making them into perfect vehicles of Christian faith and praise. But soon they began to add contributions of their own, in which they could give unshackled expression to their beliefs and hopes. Students have discovered traces of hymns in the Apostolic writings, and in the Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul appears to be quoting from a hymn: 'Wherefore he saith, awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee.'

The joyous union of Christians as children in their Father's house, joining together in acts of praise, fulfilling the 'priesthood' which as Christians they have received, cannot exist outside the Church of Christ. As Christians won their way to power and influence, they drew into the service of religion the glorious arts—painting, sculpture, architecture, above all, music. Organs were brought into the churches: orchestras and trained choirs became adjuncts of worship: anthems and even dramatic compositions found a place in Christian services.

With the downfall of ancient civilization which had found its frame in the imperial system of Rome, Christianity entered on its long conflict with barbarism, and in the process received a stamp of ascetic gloom which it has not even yet wholly lost. Monasticism was suspicious of the Arts, which yet by a strange paradox found noble expression in the monasteries. With the Reformation came a change. 'The rise of modern hymnody,' it has been said, 'may be regarded as synchronous with the rise of Protestantism, and in the earliest hymns is mirrored the antithesis between the old religion and the new.' In one respect, perhaps, the change was not wholly good. Protestant hymns have been unduly subjective, expressing the moods of the individual believer, rather than the common aspirations of the Christian assembly. The vast collection of modern hymns, it must be admitted, contains bad poetry, unsound theology, even dubious morality. This is only to say that praise, like prayer and preaching, has passed outside the control of authority, and expresses the zeal, and also the ignorance, of the general multitude of Christians. Still, when every deduction on the score of undisciplined individualism has been made, there remains sufficient to form a notable and precious contribution to the accumulated treasure of the Church.

Psalm-singing played a great part in the early phases of the religious revolution. Thus Bishop Jewel, writing to Peter Martyr in 1560, observed on the popularity of psalm-singing among the Lon-

doners: 'You may sometimes see at Paul's Cross, after the service, six thousand persons, old and young, of both sexes, all singing together and praising God.'

Lutherans and Methodists have been the most prolific hymn-writers. But, indeed, every modern Church, when it compiles a hymn-book, must need draw upon the riches of the whole Christian society. Denominational considerations are perforce abandoned here. Hymns are the most Catholic element in Protestant worship.

To the members of the choir we would say: It is no mean privilege to lead the praises and thanksgivings of the Lord's people, and this privilege also carries its burden of responsibility. Choirs, like the clergy, may 'make the Lord's people to transgress' if, set conspicuously in the place of spiritual witness, and plainly seen to claim a spiritual character, they are none the less 'of the earth, earthy.' Think what membership of a choir may mean to the individual chorister. It provides an opportunity of rendering special service to the Church. It brings, if the choir be rightly ordered, a valuable discipline to personal character, for nothing can be done well without patient and continued effort.

Besides, the choir is itself a human association. One cannot bring people together for a common purpose, week after week, and suppose that they are not themselves affected by the mutual contact. A sphere of fellowship has been created in which heart will draw to heart, and friendships will be born and nourished. 'As iron sharpeneth iron,' said the Wise Man of Israel, 'so doth a friend the countenance of his friend.' Choirs are an influence for good, or for evil, on choristers. Every human association—a family, a school, a club, a political party, a trade union, a nation, a Church—is more than just the sum of individuals who compose it. In a strange way it grows to be itself in some sense a Person, gathering up and uttering the opinions, hopes, efforts, and ideals of its members. So it is with a choir, and this is the reason why we do well to treasure the memory of those members who have served it well.

Hymns can carry the message of salvation where sermons can find no entrance. Mrs. Alexander's exquisitely simple hymn, 'There is a green hill far away,' sung by a choir-boy, may be a more persuasive statement of the truth than a learned discourse on the Atonement. To the members of the choir we would say, think then of your work in the choir very nobly, yet very humbly. It links you on to the eternal activities of the spiritual world,

and it represents the divine 'treasure' strangely in 'earthen vessels.'

In the Life of Temple Gairdner of Cairo there is a chapter on 'the musician.' He had a genius for music and he was very critical. 'How did this critic tolerate the sloppy amateur performances that were Cairo's average, or the ragged-edged drag of the hymns at some little missionary gathering, or the piercing tunelessness of Egyptian voices forced into European airs? . . . The fact remains that he so threw himself into these little amateur performances that the amateurs excelled themselves.'

Of his own music his friend Brother Douglas Downs wrote: 'I never knew that music could be so spiritual and sacramental until I heard his interpretation of some passages of Elgar. He showed me for the first time in my life that music may be the very language of heaven.'

So let us end by addressing the text directly to all of us, and more particularly to all who are members of the choir: 'Be filled with the Spirit; speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord.'

The Christian Gospel and Physical Health.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERIC C. SPURR, BIRMINGHAM.

THE least observant person cannot fail to notice the growth of certain movements in our time, which have for their aim the prevention and the elimination of disease by purely mental or spiritual methods. These movements are not essentially new: the 'new' thing about them is the denial of the 'reality' of disease, and the consequent necessity of ridding the world of physicians, surgeons, nurses, hospitals, and clinics, and installing in their place readers who, by expounding a certain philosophy, can clear the human mind of its 'false beliefs,' and so banish the 'false belief' that diseased tissues have any existence. What does not exist cannot harm, therefore the supposed harm vanishes when the bogey is exposed. It is all very simple, and the simplicity of it has created a body of men and women who, despite their profession that they are only returning to primitive Christianity, and their adoption of two great names 'Christian' and 'Science,' are nevertheless in direct opposition to the Christianity which has been known for nineteen centuries, and also to that science which, partly through the microscope, has revealed the hitherto hidden things of man's physical and mental nature. 'Christian Science' draws its clientele mainly from the orthodox Christian Churches, and an analysis of that clientele is very instructive. It consists, for the most part, of persons who suffer from neuroses, and who probably have nothing whatever the matter with them; of persons who have sought in vain medical aid, and persons who have never had any intellectual groundwork of their religious faith. The last

named are particularly liable to be victimized by any plausible philosophy which seems to hold the promise of happiness.

Other healing movements are associated with Apocalyptic theology. An artificial framework is constructed into which religion must be fitted 'four-square.'

And other movements, notably that of 'New Thought,' have no necessary connexion with religion at all other than a vague pantheism. All our recuperative powers are 'within' ourselves. We have simply to assert the 'God within,' and fullness of life and power flow into us.

In the Church of England sporadic movements appear. Yesterday it was Mr. Hickson. To-day it is a Brighton clergyman. To-morrow another will appear.

Meanwhile Rome goes on its way, indifferent to all such movements, being content with S. Winifred's Well, Lourdes, and La Salette.

Without entering into a detailed analysis of these various systems, it will be sufficient to say that each of them can boast of its cures, and that in many cases the cures are genuine. Nothing is gained by denying this. The psychologist can quite easily account for many of them, but there are others of which it is best to say, 'This is the finger of God.' None, however, can say exactly where the separating line should be drawn. Perhaps it is not necessary to draw a line at all. The fatal thing in every system is that for the most part the cure is announced *without any diagnosis having been made.*

Patients allege that they have been cured of cancer, or of some other malady, but in a vast number of cases we have only their word for it, and it is notorious that nothing is easier to misunderstand than a symptom. Persons who have little more than the most elementary knowledge of physiology are often quite confident that they are suffering from diseases which a competent diagnosis cannot discover, and which later are clearly demonstrated not to have existed. Such persons, 'cured' of an imaginary malady, become the apostles of a cult which thrives upon cases of this kind and advertises them as evidence of the truth of its doctrines. The falseness of the whole conception is easily concealed from those who have 'the will to believe' anything that promises them relief from their obsession. The thing passes into tragedy when a victim of a disease, which diagnosis reveals as malignant, refuses to accept the fact that it can only be treated by the removal of the physical cause of the *malaise*, and, disdaining the aid which science offers, finally passes beyond all aid. Coroners are justified in describing as almost criminal the wilful ignorance of 'healers' who, in the interests of a metaphysical theory, condemn to death 'patients' who might be saved by the use of proven remedies. The ghastly failures of 'Christian Science,' which it is often sought to hide, but which despite desperate efforts to conceal become public, should suffice to make men and women cautious in accepting, without careful examination, a system which ruins as many lives as it delivers.

Criticism of these various systems is of course easy. Each of them has so many vulnerable points that it is not difficult to make a breach and to storm the citadel. 'Christian Science' in particular lends itself to this treatment, and indeed invites it, on account of its claim to be something *in advance* of Jesus. There can be no question whatever that Mrs. Eddy herself made claims which practically, and sometimes in specific terms, place her in the first position. At every public address her name is advanced as the 'discoverer' of Christian Science. No human being taught her. Her revelation was received from on High. Emblazoned on the arches of many a Christian Science 'Church' is her name, side by side with that of 'Jesus' (*never* 'our Lord'). It is *her* comments on the Bible that constitute the true interpretation of the Sacred Writings. The fact that many editions of 'Science Health' have appeared, each of them correcting previous editions, makes a big drain upon that faith which accepts the theory of a specially revealed system. The average person may be

excused if he inquires *which* edition preserves the authentic Divine message, and how the crudities of the early editions can be reconciled with late 'revelations.'

The critic who is in possession of the 'official' life of Mrs. Eddy, and also corrects this by the documentary evidence supplied later by Dakin and especially by John V. Dittmore, finds himself compelled to erase from his mind the legendary picture of a woman who, from the first, was well educated, a linguist, a genius, and a saint, and to substitute for it the banal portrait of a neurotic girl, self-willed, ill-educated, confused in thought, and finally developing into a Dictator, with an abnormal love of power and a lust for money. And he sees also a woman who, despite her teaching, has a defective memory concerning her humbler days; convenient but not convincing explanations of the passing away of her former linguistic accomplishments, and who also wore false teeth, resorted to glasses for defective vision, called in the aid of physicians to inject morphia into her veins, and who to the end was terrorized by the haunting thought of 'malicious mesmerism'—in fine, a victim of fear.

The critic who knows the history of psychology and the story of former healing movements, has no difficulty in disposing of the Eddy claim to have received a special revelation. He finds the 'revelation' to be very old, very mixed, very contradictory and incoherent. Yet he discovers in the system certain truths which it is well to preserve, but which in no way are original. They have been taught for centuries, even before Christ. What the critic properly resents as an impertinence is the claim that these are the exclusive property of a modern prophetess, who has plagiarized and copy-righted.

It is not with criticism, however, that this article is mainly concerned. Its purpose is constructive. If it be true that 'every heresy' is a call to truth to free itself from its accretions, and assert itself in its purity, we may say that the modern healing systems, ragged and disjointed as they are, are a challenge to the Church to rediscover something which she may have obscured, or overlooked—'Christian Science' is such a challenge. It comes at an appropriate moment, when psychology has opened up new vistas, and interpreted old things in a new and better way.

When the 'Elder' prayed for the 'beloved Gaius' that he might 'prosper in every way and keep well—as indeed your soul is keeping well' (3 Jn 2 Moffatt), he was offering not only a perfect prayer:

but expounding a spiritual philosophy. It has taken the world many centuries to discover the profound truth which underlies these words. To-day, it is an accepted commonplace that the healthy mind is the surest way to secure true prosperity, and especially health of body. The day has passed when disease is accepted as the will of God. To science, as well as to a truer conception of the Christian gospel, we owe the insistence upon the dominance of life and health in the scheme of things. Our Lord's word, 'I came that they might have life and have it in abundance' (Jn 10¹⁰), is charged with fuller meaning, and is seen to extend to the entire life of man. Men are beginning to appreciate, as never before, the glory of the old Saxon 'hal'—hale—whole. The salutation 'hallo' has yielded a higher meaning—'health to you.' Life is now conceived of as an equality and harmony of *all* the parts of our human nature. The quest for health has become a passion. The 'pallid beauty' of the Victorian Age has vanished in favour of glowing cheeks, eyes darting with fire, gladness, content, and an overplus of physical life. The 'goddess of health' has reappeared.

Many who refuse to follow Christ as the Lord of all good life invoke Him as the great Healer. Even 'Christian Science' had to annex the holy name of Christ in order to be respectable. The Holy Figure of the Gospels is surrounded with a circle of light. The Divine Teacher and Revealer of God and Saviour of Mankind is placed in the margin, where He remains in obscurity, while the Healer fills the canvas. *So far as it goes*, the picture is true, imperfect though it be. For our Lord did treat disease as contrary to God's will. It burdened Him, and He banished it by His Word and inflow of His Life and Power. But He came to do very much more than that.

They who claim to have Him on their side in the abolition of disease are right. They are wrong, however, when they see in Him no more than a Healer. In confining themselves to physical health they omit the main factor of His work, which deals with ultimate causes and not alone with nearer causes.

We may freely admit that suffering has its uses. It corrects the aberrations of men, compels them to think and to review their manner of living, tends to destroy their native selfishness and creates new sympathies. The Saints and great souls have risen above it. The 'unconquerable soul' has triumphed over the weakness of the flesh. Yet there is no necessity in the nature of things that disease should attack man and reduce his power of useful-

ness. We must still believe that it is not the direct will of God for His children. Most disease is brought upon man by man himself. It is a significant fact that wild animals and birds are generally healthy, and that when temporary indisposition overtakes them, they are guided by a natural instinct to the natural remedies. But, in captivity, the wild animals are often attacked by maladies which an artificial life creates. When they are free to obey the law of their life they are healthy. When that freedom is denied they suffer.

Why, then, does man suffer? Because he is ignorant of the laws of his life, or he disobeys them, wittingly or unwittingly. And by the law of solidarity he causes the innocent to suffer. Man has many invisible enemies—germs and the like—which have to be resisted. But in the human body there are millions of corpuscular soldiers whose business it is to deal with these enemies. They fail because man *starves* them and they succumb. Man also has marvellous helpers, food, air, light, water; but he abuses them by his artificial manner of living. He excluded from his cities and houses the pure air and fills his lungs with vitiated air. We are told that few people understand the art of proper breathing. 'Deep breathing' is not practised by the majority.

We cook our food badly, boiling out the salts and minerals from vegetables, and throwing them away as refuse, while we serve for food the remainder. We eat badly. Most people will not be at the trouble to inquire what foods, and in what proportions, are necessary for body-building. We are allured by our palate rather than by common sense and knowledge. We lower the value of the natural digestive juices by reducing them with liquids. And few people ever flush their inner canals. In a word, the body is badly treated, and it rebels, and disease is the result. What men have forgotten is that the body is a temple of the Holy Ghost. It is often turned into a slum.

Now, what has the Christian gospel to say to all this? None will deny that it has inspired physicians and scientists to understand the body and to urge men to obey its laws. It has also set itself through many agencies to cure disease, not only by denying the obvious fact that disease is of the tissues as well as of the mind, but by operations (where necessary) and by remedies which deal with the blood, and with local troubles. To speak of cancer, tumours, fevers, and the like as having no existence save in 'mortal mind,' or to say that poisons cannot poison, is to speak the language of the insane. Healing must regard the actual state of the body.

But the special emphasis of the gospel is upon man's state of mind or soul. It is not said that 'the body is nothing,' or that its ailments do not require material treatment. It does say that the health of the body is largely dependent upon the health of the soul. And it is this that modern psychology has rediscovered.

It is notorious that an unhealthy mind adversely affects the body. Evil thinking leads to practices which imperil the flesh. The person who feeds his mind upon moral garbage will, sooner or later, incarnate in his features and in his entire body the filth of his spirit. Grief, anger, unkindness, jealousy, anxiety, and the like literally poison the body. Dr. Hadfield mentions cases of mothers who through wrong mental states have poisoned their babes at their breasts. On the other hand, the perfectly healthy mind offers both food and medicine to the body. 'A merry heart doeth good like a medicine.'

Modern systems of mental healing proceed upon such facts as these. But their limitations are manifest. They tend to confine their actions within the man himself. 'All your resources are within yourself.' The healing consists in making the mind dominant over the flesh; and within that limit there is a certain success. But it is a *selfish* success. The man never escapes from his own limitations. His ego remains his centre. Hence we find that altruism dies. Or if 'God' be invoked, it is in order to exploit Him in the personal interests. 'Christian Science' is essentially selfish. 'Happiness' is its great word. *The gospel goes all the way*, and takes man beyond himself and his personal happiness. Its message is 'Your mind is not sufficient. You must become one with the mind of God. He is your life and health, but the health He offers you is not for yourself alone, it is solely that you use it for the accomplishment of His Will and purpose.' Is not that the real meaning of our Lord's linking of healing with the forgiveness of sins? The healing was more than an act of benevolence, beginning

and ending with itself. It was the answer to the prayer, 'Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven.'

Christianity has far more than a vague word about 'God.' The God it offers is mediated through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is through union with His Divine Personality that *our* personalities are really brought into 'tune with the Infinite.' For what Christ gives to man is a new outlook upon life, a new inner adjustment to God, carrying with it a new power of self-control, and a new insight into the relation of the body to the soul, and the soul to God. He is Redeemer as well as Healer. So the Christian gospel alone has a gospel of complete health, for it alone binds man to God. The life and power of Christ flowing into the spirit of man cleanses and invigorates it, and makes it one with His Spirit. And so the body becomes not only the servant of man's spirit, but the servant of Christ.

It is this specifically Christian gospel that is ignored both by 'Christian Science' and by most of the modern systems, from Mesmer to Coué and Trine.

The modern systems, with their religious jargon, constitute a definite challenge to the Christian Church to re-think the truth and implications of its gospel. It may be that our emphasis has been only partial; that on the one hand we have been too much occupied with the 'salvation of the soul' as to forget that man is physical as well as psychical; and, on the other, to be caught with the nearer thing and to place so much confidence in physical means as to forget the great fact which psychology is now emphasizing. The balance needs restoring. Strange and weird cults always arise when Christianity is only partially presented, and they always perish when the truth sets men free.

The way to deal with the menacing systems of our time is not to denounce them, but to counter them. It is in the partial light that error flourishes. In the complete light, error, unable to bear the revealing beam, fades away.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

THE second Heft of the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (Mohr, Tübingen) for 1935 contains five studies and addresses on aspects of the Church,

especially as affected by the contemporary situation in Germany. Professor Hans Gerbert opens with a thoughtful paper on Church and State, in which he is obviously careful about giving more than general directions; as a jurist and a religious man, he

recognizes that political and religious interests both lead to forms of association, and drops some prudent hints to votaries of both, without committing himself to any definite programme. Professor Weinel's paper on 'Church and People' is more critical of such movements as that championed by Herr Hauer. Dr. Knittenmeyer of Bremen is occupied with the standpoint of 'der Mensch der Erkenntnis,' which is not peculiar to Germany, though his arguments naturally refer to German intellectualism. Professor Thimme objects to anything like episcopal leadership in the Evangelical Church, and Professor Traub of Tübingen declines to follow Heim in speaking of 'the revelation of Christ in the Old Testament'; only God is revealed there, and stress should be laid on the originality of the conceptions of Jesus, if the heterogeneous content of the Old Testament religion is to be truly valued. None of the essays has very much that is new to contribute to problems which have been often handled in other countries, but each of them is certainly alive with a sense that for Germans to-day they are living issues on which fresh statements are required from responsible religious men.

Brunner's lectures¹ at the University of Copenhagen outline what he rightly believes to be a need of modern theology, a restatement of this article of the Creed: 'I believe in the Holy Spirit.' They are trenchant, fresh discussions of its three dimensions, as it faces the historical past (faith), the present situation of the Christian (love), and the future (hope). What Brunner emphasizes above all is that belief in the Spirit is bound up with belief in God the Creator and Jesus Christ the Lord; he insists that this must be held, if we are to understand the fruitfulness of belief in the Spirit and to undertake the task which even the great reformers did not succeed in achieving, although they indicated its main lines, *i.e.* the relation of the Spirit to the Bible and to dogma. To those who are familiar with Brunner's writings, this pamphlet has little that is new; its value consists in the incisive analysis of Christian experience and in its exposure of what is called 'Christian Mysticism,' or sentimental belief in human capacity, as well as in a searching protest against metaphysical rationalism and sceptical psychology of the Freud order. He desires to show how the true idea of the Spirit conserves the essential message of the New Testament, namely, personal fellowship with Jesus Christ the Lord, as opposed to any undue reliance upon

subjective piety or objective dogma. Incidentally there is a severe critique of the Augustinian 'infusio caritatis' (p. 39 f.), a refusal to take Luther's 'simul justus, simul peccator' as entirely adequate to the New Testament (p. 57 f.), and a protest against minimizing eschatology (p. 63 f.). The central theme is, in his own words, 'It is the Holy Spirit whereby Jesus Christ becomes a living personal reality for us, instead of an historical recollection. What the Father is and what the Son is, we know only through the Spirit' (p. 73). It is the emphasis upon this context of belief in the Spirit which makes Brunner's statement so suggestive; whatever be thought of his particular exegesis and arguments, he is at the centre in such a conception of the subject.

Professor Wrede's monograph, which was first issued thirty years ago, has been reprinted.² The criticism of the Fourth Gospel has passed through several phases during the interval, but some of Wrede's contentions have been upon the whole accepted, and it is a welcome gift to receive this essay, even although it has not, of course, been brought up to date. Wrede's chief interest lay in the business of interpreting the apologetic tendencies which prompted the author to produce such a novel estimate of Jesus, in particular the ideas of Christ's Person and work which appealed to circles about the end of the first century. According to Wrede, these ideas so dominate the author's mind that the various figures are introduced into the story simply for the purpose of enabling the dialectic method to elaborate its conclusions; their realistic traits, we might say, are little more than a Defoe-like method of representing ideas, and not evidence of any independent acquaintance with historical traditions unknown to the synoptic writers. The clue to the Fourth Gospel lies in the recognition of a milieu of gnostic ideas about the Person of Christ (p. 30 f.), against which the author of 'John' offers a truer interpretation, but also he has in mind a contemporary Jewish criticism of Christianity (p. 42 f.), which took exception to Christ's miracles and Messianic claims in particular. The conclusion is, that the Fourth Gospel is a predecessor of Justin's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, although it is meant for members of the Church.

² D. W. Wrede, *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannes-evangeliums*, photomechanisch gedruckte Auflage. Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte, 37 (Mohr, Tübingen, M. 1.50).

¹ Emil Brunner, *Vom Werk des Heiligen Geistes* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1935).

To re-read this in the light of recent criticism is to recognize that Wrede at any rate had grasped one feature of the document; he sees that the Gospel goes back to a single, strong mind. This essay suffers from a failure to appreciate any source-criticism, but on the other hand it brings out, what recent speculations about a Redactor and a Witness have often failed to notice, the unity of genius in the book. No doubt the milieu of ideas cannot have been confined to a single writer. There must have been a circle (call it 'Johannine' or anything else, for the sake of convenience) in which such views were current, and the present state of the book betrays evidence of more hands than one in its composition. Nevertheless, literary criticism has recognized, what Wrede assumes in his pamphlet, that the Fourth Gospel as a whole comes from one powerful thinker, whoever he may have been.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

It is interesting to observe that the current number of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Band liii. Heft 1), like its immediate predecessor, is dominated by a single note. In the last issue, the main subject was the textual criticism of the Old Testament; in the present number three out of the five principal articles are concerned with the prophets of the Old Testament.

Karl Elliger discusses the political aspect of the prophetic message, contesting the view (traced back to Troeltsch) that their attitude to national and international life was based on a kind of religious Utopia. Elliger does, indeed, insist that the message of the canonical prophets was due to a close and intimate knowledge of God, but they were very far from being misty visionaries who took no account of the situation with which their contemporaries were faced. On the contrary they were realists, accepting and facing the facts that lay before them, often modifying the details of their message as the position changed about them. In truth, their political attitude is far too complicated to admit of easy explanation along any one simple line.

Prophetic psychology is treated from two different points of view. F. Puukko draws parallels from phenomena observed in Finland and Siberia. He confines himself mainly to the earlier type of Israelite prophet, for he is unable to accept the view that the canonical prophets were invariably ecstatic. Even so, Shamanism might not seem at first sight a very promising source of new light on

the Old Testament. Nevertheless, the parallels drawn, and particularly the description of the methods of excitation used, are most illuminating, and the writer concludes with a really sympathetic recognition of the genuine religious element in these lower forms of faith. In the second place, W. E. Peuckert describes the experiences of some of the German 'prophets' of the early seventeenth century, and compares them with those of the canonical prophets of the Old Testament. The instances he cites all lie within a few years of 1630—just the period when Gustavus Adolphus was playing an active part in the Thirty Years' War. Peuckert shows how similar were the experiences of these men, though there was not necessarily any communication between them, and ascribes the resemblances to the reaction of similar temperaments to the same external conditions. The temperament he finds in them all is that of the 'sore soul,' or the 'wounded spirit,' and he suggests—with some reason—that this may have been characteristic also of men like Hosea and Jeremiah.

Articles on the prophets, however, do not exhaust the contents of this issue. It opens with a letter of greeting to the veteran Palestinian scholar, Gustav Dalman, whose long life of service to Biblical scholarship now reaches its eightieth year. There are two more articles of importance, one by Hans Bauer, throwing new light in details on the deities of Ras Shamra, and the other by Otto Eissfeldt, perhaps the most vigorous and illuminating of living Old Testament scholars, on the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. With a wealth of illustration, drawn from many sources and including much new matter, he shows that the pronunciation *Yahweh* or *Yahwah* must have continued in Irak down to the 7th cent. A.D., and in Samaria down to modern times. Eissfeldt does not claim to advance a new theory; he does claim, and justly, to have adduced valuable new support for that which has long been current.

In shorter communications Sellin describes the inscription on a jar-handle from Jericho, and Begrich suggests that Athaliah was the daughter, not of Ahab but of Omri. Finally, the editor promises his readers some information on the inscriptions which Mr. Starkey has recently discovered at Tell Duweir. Altogether this is a number which worthily maintains the great traditions of the journal.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Caràiff.

The publishing house of Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, has issued two valuable theological studies:

(1) *The Presence of Christ in the Church.*¹ by Hans Christoph von Hase, Lic. theol. The subject is fully treated from the point of view both of the modern Protestant and the modern Catholic theology. The presence of Christ is much more than the realization of the abiding results of His historic personality; Schleiermacher replied effectively to rationalistic views by insisting upon the *personal* presence of Christ. The suggestive exposition of the meaning of Christ's presence in the Church is marred by the denial of the possibility of any direct, immediately apprehensible presence of Christ by the individual believer. (2) *The Significance of Prayer for the Knowledge of*

¹ *Die Gegenwart Christi in der Kirche* (R.M.2.70).

*God,*² by Dr. Carl Stange, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. The philosophical basis of faith in God does not dispense with, but rather emphasizes the need for, the study of religion as the source of our knowledge of God. 'Prayer is not only the root from which our knowledge of God springs, and not only the way by which we attain to an ever-deepening knowledge of God, it is also a spiritual experience by which we become partakers of the promised salvation of God.'

J. G. TASKER.

Tunbridge Wells.

² *Die Bedeutung des Gebetes für die Gotteserkenntnis* (R.M.1.40).

Contributions and Comments.

The Parable of the Unjust Steward: An Interpretation.

ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας.—
Lk 16°.

THE teaching which our Lord intended to convey in the Parable of the Unjust Steward has been variously interpreted, but always with the note of apology; there has in none of the explanations been the conviction that the illustration He used was adequate and apposite: at best, the lesson has been considered to be one of the redemption of unworthy material for worthy spiritual ends: at worst, it has been taken as a vindication of worldly wisdom. All this ambiguity would disappear, and a new light be thrown on the parable, if a single change of half a word is made in the text as it now stands.

Dittography was one of the commonest of scribal errors, and it usually occurred with reference to prepositions. Codex Bezae gives us a typical one in Ac 1°: the manuscript reads:

ΚΕΕΙΕΝΤΩΧΡΟΝΩΤΟΥΤΩ
ΑΠΟΚΑΤΑΚΤΑΝΕΙCΙΘΗΝΒΑCΙΛΕΙΑΝΤΩCΡΑΗΛ

the εἰς being inadvertently repeated. Later scribes often corrected such errors off-hand, and it was easy for them to make the reverse mistake themselves—to leave out as a repetitional error what

actually was part of the text. This is what appears to have happened in Lk 16°: the restored text, (in the Sinai Codex) would read:

ΕΑΥΤΟΙCΤΟΙ
ΗCΑΤΕΦΙΛΟΥCΕΚ
(ΤΟC)ΤΟΥΜΑΜΩΝΑΤΗC
ΑΔΙΚΙΑC

The great advantage of this emendation is that it makes sense. Our Lord has told how the Unjust Steward made friends by means of unrighteous mammon: we are left to imagine what happened when the ex-steward called upon his newly-made 'friends'—they were not likely to value his friendship, and the time would very soon come when their sense of obligation and gratitude would fail and the steward would find himself as friendless as before. Then comes our Lord's moral: 'Therefore I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends *without* the mammon of unrighteousness, *i.e.* let the basis of your friendship be something more trustworthy, more honourable, than monetary convenience—do not fall into the error of thinking that you can *buy* your friends—so that, when money shall fail, your true friends may receive you into *everlasting* habitations.' The perishable money of the steward bought him perishable friendships: friendships formed without any relation to this world and its goods will abide when this world order has passed away; they are untainted with the mammon of

unrighteousness, and untainted too with its perishable qualities.

The emendation of *ἐκ* to *ἐκτός* must remain a conjecture: at least it is natural enough to merit careful consideration, and the new meaning gained almost forces one to the conviction of its correctness. The parable in this case is not a parable of Stewardship, but of Friendship: it points to the truth that so fine a thing as friendship is not available in the money market, and life's highest values are only maintained and won by the highest of methods.

The parable ends at v.⁹, but vv.¹⁰⁻¹³ are full of interest, and demonstrate a favourite method of compilation in the Gospel narrative. The well-known passage in Mk 9⁴²⁻⁵⁰ shows how an outstanding word of our Lord's may suggest another saying, which is recorded off-hand without regard to the lack of logical connexion in the sayings themselves. The Marcan passage comprises five separate sayings, connected respectively with the words *σκανδαλίζω*, *πῦρ*, and *ἄλας*. In this Lucan passage, the thoughts in the Evangelist's mind centre round Stewardship and Mammon. Vv.^{10, 11}, which make no conceivable sense in connexion with this parable, are obviously transferred from the Parable of the Talents and fit perfectly between vv.^{24, 25} of Lk 19. We have even an echo of the words in v.¹⁷ preceding, namely, *ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ πιστός*. Secondly, both the steward parables (as reconstructed) include the use of the word *μαμῶνα*, which has tended to the confusion and which accounts for the insertion in v.¹³ of the otherwise irrelevant apophthegm of the two Masters—the third occasion on which our Lord made mention of the word *μαμῶνα*. So here we have three 'Mammon' passages:

- (a) v.⁹, properly belonging to the Parable of the Unjust Steward, and conveying the lesson of the irrelevance of material things in the moral sphere.
- (b) v.¹¹, transposed from the Parable of the Talents; illustrating how character shows itself in little things as well as in great.
- (c) v.¹³, which we find in its true setting in Mt 6²⁴ in the section which appropriately begins:
μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
a discourse on earthly and heavenly things.

Must we try, as Gore does in the New Commentary, to find a logical sequence in these three passages, or is it sufficient to recognize them as three separate *λόγια*, with three separate messages, juxtaposed in

our version of Luke through the similarity of verbal expression?
J. C. WANSEY.

Church House, Walthamstow.

A Note on St. John ii. 20.

'Forty and six years was this temple in building' (A.V. and R.V.), *τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος*. This is an impossible translation on two counts; the substantive is in the dative of a point, and not of duration, of time; and the verb is in the aorist and not in the imperfect, so the only possible translation is: 'This temple (or sanctuary) was built (before you were born) forty and six years ago.' And hereby hangs a tale. 'The fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar' (Lk 3¹) falls in some portion of A.D. 28 and 29, and the only question is whether it is to be reckoned from Nisan 1 according to the Palestinian, or Sept. 1 according to the Antiochene customary mode of reckoning (see J. K. Fotheringham, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxxv [1934], 146-163). It is not said that the preaching of St. John the Baptist began at the beginning of the year, but only some time in the course of it, consequently we must allow for an interval before the preaching, and a second interval before it became popular, so that crowds flocked to the bank of the Jordan. Then there was a third interval of some six or seven weeks between our Lord's baptism and the beginning of His ministry, in which the Temptation took place. We cannot, therefore, put the beginning of His ministry as early as the Passover of 29; nor can His ministry have lasted less than a year. The Crucifixion, therefore, cannot have taken place as early as the Passover of 30. But it could not have occurred in 31 or 32, because the 15th of Nisan fell neither on a Thursday nor on a Friday in those years. Consequently the Crucifixion took place in 33 (which is the date decided on by the Pope). If it took place in 33, then we have both the Johannine length of the ministry and the Johannine dating for the Crucifixion, for the 15th of Nisan began at sunset on Good Friday, so our Lord died 'between the evenings,' which was the time of the slaying of the Pascal Lambs.

The Cleansing of the Temple, according to St. John, took place at the Passover (2¹³); this then must be the Passover of 30. Josephus's sources give two systems of dating for the accession of Herod the Great, (a) from his proclamation as king in Rome in 40 B.C., and (b) from his capture

of Jerusalem and taking over the Government in 37 (see T. Corbishley, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxxvi. [1935] 22-32). Josephus (*Antiquities*, xv. xi. 1) says that Herod began to build the Temple 'in the eighteenth year of his reign,' but in his *Wars of the Jews*, i. xxi., he says: 'in the fifteenth year of his reign'; these two dates mean the same year, 23-22 B.C. The Temple took eight years to build (Josephus, *Antiquities*, xv. xi. 5), so that it was finished in 16-15 B.C., and forty-seven years after that will bring us to A.D. 30. This authenticates St. John's account of the Cleansing. There may also have been a second Cleansing in the Holy Week of 33, but this must be regarded as doubtful, since St. Mark puts all the ministry in Galilee first, and has only this week to give for events in Jerusalem, and he is followed in his general arrangement by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

F. J. BADCOCK.

St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.

'Αποθνήσκω in the New Testament.

It is notorious that many subtleties of Greek usage were recovered by the rigorous and critical scholarship of the last two generations. This rediscovery of usage was not least marked in the field of the Attic verb. One example of this is to be seen in the dictum that in mature Attic prose, while ἀποκτείνω, ἀποκτενῶ, ἀπέκτεινα are the active forms, the passive are drawn from ἀποθνήσκω, ἀποθανοῦμαι, ἀπέθανον, and τέθηκα. How far does this Attic list of principal parts persist in Hellenistic Greek, and, in particular, in the Greek of the New Testament?

In that Greek we find a plentiful number of synonyms employed to express *killing*. Besides ἀποκτείνω we have σφάζω, θανατῶ, νεκρῶ, and φονεύω, and it may be of interest to consider whether any distinctions appear in the shades of meaning conveyed by these words.

1. φονεύω certainly carries with it the judgment that the killing was murder. Accordingly we find it used to translate the sixth commandment, οὐ φονεύσεις.

2. νεκρῶ is used for metaphorical killing, the starving, deadening, mortifying of passions, as St. Paul says (Col 3^b), νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη, and also for the decay of old age (Ro 4¹⁰); κατενόμην τὸ ἐάντῳ σώμα νενεκρωμένον (cf. He 11¹²).

3. θανατῶ is used literally for the putting to death or bringing about death by, for example,

legal process, so that it is not strictly murder by direct attack—as Clough makes the distinction when he writes:

Thou shalt not kill, but need'st not strive
Officiously to keep alive.

Instances of this literal use are to be seen in Mt 10²¹, παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς, and its parallel in Mk 13¹² and Mt 26⁵⁹, and the parallel in Mk 14⁵⁵ and Lk 21¹⁶, παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν. The same literal and legal sense appears in 2 Co 6⁹, ὡς παιδευόμενοι καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι ('flogged and not executed'), and 1 P 3¹⁸, Χριστὸς . . . ἀπέθανεν . . . θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι. So again in Ro 8³⁶, quoted from Ps 44²². Besides, the word is used metaphorically, like νεκρῶ in Ro 7⁴, ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, and so also in 8¹³.

4. The use of σφάζω exhibits some interesting features. It is used by the writers of the first Johannine Epistle and of the Johannine Apocalypse alone of all New Testament writers. Whether this small agreement in vocabulary points to an identity in the authors is a subject for discussion that would carry us too far from our present purpose: it is enough that we should call attention to it. The connotation of the word is, in origin, the cutting of the throat and so the killing of an animal, especially in sacrifice, and although this narrower significance has passed into a wider sense centuries before the books of the New Testament were written, we may suspect that the sacrificial implication is not altogether lost in, e.g., Rev 5⁸, ἀρνίον ἐστηκὸς ὡς εσφαγμένον, and similarly in 5¹² 13⁸. The same may be said of the use in 5⁹, where the Elders in their new song address the Lamb in the words, ἄξιός ἐστι . . . ὅτι ἐσφάγης καὶ ἡγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς. Interesting in its suggestiveness is the phrasing of 13³, where we read of τὸ θηρίον as having μίαν τῶν κεφαλῶν αὐτοῦ ὡς εσφαγμένην εἰς θάνατον, καὶ ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ἐθεραπεύθη. In the remaining passages σφάζω would seem to have shed any semblance of its primitive precision of meaning and to mean no more than *to kill*, or better, perhaps, *to butcher*. So in 6⁴, ἐδόθη αὐτῷ λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἵνα ἀλλήλους σφάξουσιν, and in 6⁹, and 18²⁴. In 1 Jn 3¹², ἐσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ χάριν τίνος ἐσφαξεν αὐτόν, there may be some reminiscence of the sacrificial significance of the

word, in view of the importance attached elsewhere to the blood of Abel.

5. Here should be noted, perhaps, the use of *θύω* in Mk 14¹², *ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουν*, compared with Ac 11⁷, *ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, θύσον καὶ φάγε*, and also *ἀναιρεῖν* to *make away with* or *to execute*, as in Ac 5³³ 9²⁹ 16²⁷ 23²⁷ 26¹⁰ and Lk 23³². This latter word, it may be observed, is almost peculiar to St. Luke, who has it twice in the Gospel, and nineteen times in the Acts of the Apostles. It is found otherwise only in Mt 2¹⁶ and—but here rather in the sense of *getting rid of* than of *killing*—in 2 Th 2⁸, *ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ κύριος [Ἰησοῦς] ἀνελεί τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ*, and in He 10⁹, *ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ*.

6. The active of *ἀποκτείνω* exhibits no features in the Greek of the New Testament which distinguish it from that of the Attic writers. We find, however, some passive forms which the mature Attic would have abjured. In Mk 8³¹ we have *δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι*. . . . Here *ἀποθανεῖν* might have been understood to mean that He must die: *ἀποκτανθῆναι* emphasizes the shame and horror of death by killing. Mt 16²¹ repeats the word, as does Luke also in 9²². Mk 9³¹ similarly uses *ἀποκτανθεῖς*, where an Attic writer, it may be said, would certainly have written *ἀποθανών* since it is preceded by *ἀποκτείνουσιν αὐτόν*, so that there could be no ambiguity as to the mode of death. This passive aorist is not used elsewhere in the New Testament except in the Apocalypse, where it occurs eight times (21³ 9^{18, 20} 11^{5, 13} 13^{10, 15} 19²¹), in several of which, for example in 13¹⁰, *ἀποθνήσκω* might have been used without ambiguity, as would have been done by an Attic writer.

7. In the New Testament no less than in Attic writers *ἀποθνήσκω* is of frequent occurrence. Naturally it often has unquestionably the mere sense of *die*. Can we say that it never has the Attic significance of *be killed*? An unequivocal answer seems to be supplied by such a passage as Mt 26⁵², if the reading of some MSS which give *ἀποθανοῦνται* could be accepted in place of the sounder text *ἀπολοῦνται*. The verbal similarity to Rev 13¹⁰ would make this example incontrovertible if the reading had been acceptable.¹ There are, however, many other passages throughout the New Testament which suggest that most of the

writers did use *ἀποθνήσκω* as the ordinary passive of *ἀποκτείνω*. Particularly noticeable is the use in the sense of *be executed, suffer the death penalty*. Examples of this may be seen in Jn 18¹⁴, *συμφέρει ἕνα ἀνθρώπων ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ*. Cf. Jn 11⁵⁰ and 51 19⁷ and Ac 25¹¹, *εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀδικῶ καὶ ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραχά τι, οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν*; cf. also He 10²⁸. Perhaps the same may be said of Jn 12³³, *τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον, σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλον ἀποθνήσκειν*, where what is commented on is the passive *ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ*. Still more suggestive is Jn 18^{31, 32}, *εἶπον αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτείνειν οὐδένα ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλον ἀποθνήσκειν*. Here special point is lent to the words if we understand them to mean that the Lord's saying indicated that He should be slain, not by stoning at the hands of the Jews, but by crucifixion at the hands of the Romans. In other passages we may perhaps at least say this much, that *ἀποθνήσκω* implies a violent death—slaying. For this we may quote Mt 26³⁵, *κἀν δέῃ με σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι*; Jn 11¹⁸, *ἄγωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ*; Ac 21¹³, *ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ μόνον δεθῆναι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ* (it will be observed that here *ἀποθανεῖν* is treated as quite parallel in construction to an aorist passive infinitive).

In some passages, while it cannot be said that the sense absolutely demands that we should interpret the word as meaning, *be executed or be killed*, it is fair to claim that an improvement is effected in the sense if this interpretation be adopted. In Jn 8²¹, *ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὧμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε*, this interpretation will carry us back in thought to the death penalty pronounced upon Adam. In Ro 8³⁴, *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀποθανών, μάλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς*, the parallelism with the aorist passive participle is noticeable ('slain=by men . . . raised to life by God'). In Ro 14¹⁵, *ἐκεῖνον= . . . ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν*, it is not merely, perhaps, that Christ gave His life to save the sinner, but that He paid the death penalty in the sinner's stead (cf. 1 Co 15³, Ro 5^{6, 7, 8}). In 1 Co 15³¹, *καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω*, 'I am in danger of being killed,' is shown to be the meaning by the preceding words, *τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν*; In 2 Co 6⁹, *ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν*, the sense must again be 'as being continually in danger of being killed, and yet we have all the vigour of eternal life.' In Ro 6⁷, *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαιώται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, we shall understand the sense to be 'a felon who has been executed and has paid the death penalty is held to have made purgation for his

¹ It must be acknowledged that there is no passage where *ἀποθνήσκω* is followed by *ὑπό* with the genitive, as we have it not infrequently in Attic writers, so that its passive sense is demonstrable.

crime, is purged from his offence.' This is not very different from Professor Dodd's interpretation that the Apostle is thinking how a dead man can no longer be put on his trial for a crime committed in his life (C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 91). We shall thus have the Apostle taking an illustration from ordinary human procedure and experience, just as a few verses later he finds an illustration in the law of marriage. There will be nothing in the passage which can be perverted into a comfortable belief that death in itself releases men from sin. It is Christ's death alone which was a victory over the power of sin.

In Ro 14⁹, however, ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν, we shall hardly press the words to yield any deeper significance than we get from the simple antithesis of dying and coming to life.

Finally, we may urge that in the Creed 'was crucified, slain, and buried' would be better than the present wording.

In support of this we may adduce the parallel actives in Ac 2²³, προσπήξαντες ἀνείλετε.

L. H. DENNIS and T. NICKLIN.

Hulme Hall, Manchester.

The Syro-Phœnician Woman.

THE contribution by the Rev. P. Douglas Hamilton, M.A., B.D., in the July issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, has recalled to my mind a suggestion which occurred to me some little time ago, which I have not met elsewhere and which I venture to put forth in the hope that it may commend itself as a possible explanation of a very puzzling incident.

The most puzzling features of the narrative are: (1) Christ's silence; (2) His apparent harshness; (3) His reluctance to grant the woman's request. I say frankly that I do not think the solution lies in attempting to explain away any of these, as, for example, that Christ dealt with the woman in a humorous way. That suggestion places Jesus in the position of tantalizing her unwarrantably, without really explaining His refusal at first to accede to her request.

By placing together, as complementary one to the other, the ascription of the title 'son of David' by the woman to Jesus and the words of Jesus, 'For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter,' we appear to have a clue to a solution that takes into account the puzzling features above mentioned and at the same time explains the attitude of Jesus.

It seems evident that the ascription of the title 'son' of David' is the immediate cause of the silence of Jesus. On her lips it would suggest that she had some claim on Jesus, and may have been intended by her as a means of gaining a hearing for her case by posing as one looking for the 'Expectation of Israel.' Jesus, quick to read character, saw the intended deception and answered not a word, but, refusing to acquiesce in it, passed on His way to the house, as Mark's account would imply. Followed and pressed by the woman in her need, His next step was to expose the deception, which He proceeds to do, by making the contrast between the 'children' (Israel) and the 'dogs' (the Gentiles), and by which implication the woman would realize she was included in the latter. The woman, quick to perceive Christ's meaning, immediately accepts the rebuke and, abandoning all pretence and deception, accepts her place, but realizes that Christ has left the way open for her request to be granted, which she seizes by saying that 'even the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table.' By saying this the woman acknowledges her deception and clears away the one hindrance to Jesus granting her request. Immediately the woman takes her rightful place Jesus unbends with the words, 'For this saying' (and all that it implied) 'go thy way,' etc.

The problem of the woman had been how she could persuade Jesus to cure her daughter. Being a foreigner she undoubtedly thought that she stood little chance. Her plan, which is not uncommon even to-day amongst those seeking help, was, having gained a little knowledge of her prospective benefactor, to attempt to claim as much acquaintanceship as possible, in the hope that it would gain for her plea a more favourable response. The use of the title 'son of David' together with Christ's attitude is almost a clear indication that this was the means adopted in this case.

The words of Jesus, 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' were spoken to the disciples in answer to their repeated request for Jesus to do as the woman wished and so stop her crying after them. We should not expect Christ's answer to His disciples to reveal the actual cause of His refusal, and it is plain that they at any rate saw no grounds for any, but it indicates what was passing in the mind of Jesus, and gives support to the suggestion that the obstacle was in the nature of the one indicated.

CHARLES E. GARRITT.

Manchester.

Romans xvi.: A Suggestion.

This chapter has long been a subject of discussion, scholarly opinion being divided as to whether it forms an integral part of the Epistle to the Romans or was originally meant for Ephesus. Has the following suggestion, I wonder, ever been advanced? It would seem to offer a fairly reasonable explanation of the present position of the chapter, assuming that it was written for the Church at Ephesus.

The Epistle to the Romans was written, it is generally agreed, at Corinth or its seaport, Cenchreæ, shortly before the Apostle left on his last journey to Jerusalem. Paul, according to Ac 20³, has spent three months in Greece and is just on the point of leaving for Jerusalem when he learns of a plot against his life and has to depart suddenly for the north, and, for safety's sake, takes the longer route through Macedonia. After some time he makes his way by ship to Troas, and from there goes to Miletus, where he summons the elders from Ephesus and addresses them as reported in Ac 20¹⁷⁻³⁸.

During his stay at Corinth Paul would, no doubt, have his time fully occupied, and as the day for his departure approaches he makes his plans for the future. These plans include work in Rome and in regions still further west, and accordingly he writes to the Church in the Imperial City telling them of his hopes and at the same time outlining what the Christian faith involves. This letter he plans to send as soon as he can find a suitable messenger, which he hopes to do before he sails for Syria. Suddenly, however, the plot makes him alter his plans, and hurriedly gathering his few belongings, he sets out for Macedonia.

Under these circumstances what became of the letter? It may be that it was not yet finished, or perhaps he could find no messenger, and so takes it with him, hoping to get a favourable opportunity to send it on from one of his ports of call. Ephesus, with its great volume of trade with Rome, would lend itself to this purpose, and on his way from Troas he determines to leave it with the Ephesians with instructions to forward it to its destination. As his ship does not stop at that port, he writes a note to the Ephesian congregation, greeting many of his friends and introducing Phœbe, who had lived at Cenchreæ and who was now moving to Ephesus. This note he may have inscribed on the same scroll as the Roman Epistle: in any case, he probably included it in the same packet. This packet he may have sent with the messenger who summoned the Elders to Miletus—who may have

been none other than Phœbe or one of her group—since he could not be sure that the Ephesian officials would come to him; or he may have delivered it to the Elders themselves when they did come. The Elders carried out Paul's instructions, but, instead of removing the note to their own group, sent the whole manuscript (or packet) on to Rome; or, possibly, the Ephesian Church may have made a copy of the letter and the note for their own use, with the result that the two have become associated as we now find them to be.

This suggestion is not without its difficulties, it is true, but, while we cannot be sure of any theory in the matter, it does, at least, do something to account for the attachment of the Ephesian note to the Roman letter.

FRED M. YOUNG.

Toronto.

The Lord's Pleasure in the Centurion's Faith.

THE meaning of the centurion's words as recorded in Mt 8⁹ may, perhaps, be set out in paraphrase thus: I am a man set under (Lk 7⁸) the authority of others. To that authority I submit, obeying all commands laid upon me. And because I yield such obedience to him, or them, that sent me here, my servants and soldiers yield a like obedience to me. I perceive that this is true of you 'also.' To Him that sent you, you render obedience implicit and complete; therefore these healing powers respond to your commands, commands issued under the authority delegated to you.

If this paraphrase approximates the truth, the admiration of the Lord for the centurion's faith was because of its intelligent appreciation of His relation to God. This Gentile anticipated His own words in Jn 5^{19, 30}. It is 'by faith we understand' (He 11³⁰).

According to Ps 8⁶, man was created to have dominion over fish, fowl, and beast, on the implied condition of his obedience to God. This lordship was lost to man through his refusal to acknowledge the lordship of God. Disobedience begets disobedience. Who knows not how to obey knows not how to command. So we see not yet all things put under man, but 'we see Jesus . . . crowned with glory and honour,' with 'all things put under his feet,' because He 'became obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross' (He 2⁹, Ph 2⁸).

Luke tells us that this centurion had built the Synagogue at Capernaum. We may conclude that his love of Israel would extend to Israel's sacred

writings. Had he read Ps 107²⁰, 'He sendeth his word, and healeth them,' as the Ethiopian eunuch had read Is 53, and had the situation struck him as one to which that word would be appropriate? At least his confidence in the Lord sharpened his perceptions and made him wise, whereas the scribes and Pharisees remained blind and foolish 'because they believed not' (Mt 23¹⁷, Jn 9³⁹⁻⁴¹).

C. F. HOGG.

London.

'Until the day break, and the shadows flee away.'

THIS passage occurs twice in the Song of Solomon, in 2¹⁷ and 4⁶. It is frequently quoted in modern prayers, but as so often is done in the use of O.T. quotations, a meaning is read into the words quite unjustified by the Hebrew text.

'Until the day break' means, in the original, until the cooling close of the day with its great heat, and spreading shadows, and evening approaches. Those who know the East can tell of the hours after, say, half-past four and onward, when we went out to enjoy the cooler air. In Gn 3⁸ we read of Adam and Eve hearing the voice of God 'in the cool of the day.' That is what the passage in the Song refers to. It was not the dawn of the day,

but its close. Then the shadows caused by the sun ceased. (Surely 'the cool of the dawn' is a slip or a misprint in Moffatt's Bible.)

But with us the breaking of the day is the dawn. And for this usage of the daybreak, the Hebrew has its own appropriate words, both entirely different from the word used in the Song. In Gn 32²⁶, in Jacob's prayer, the words 'the day breaketh' mean the opening of day when the sun arose. Again, in 2 S 2³², we have 'at break of day,' for the morning, when the light shone upon the world.

As used by many to-day the beautiful words, 'until the day break,' express the glad dawning of the heavenly day, and the total cessation of all the dark and sad shadows of the earthly life. This is the Christian hope, but the Hebrew text gives no justification for it. Like another verse in Scripture (Is 40³), a beautiful line has become common as declaring a voice, as it were, all forlorn, 'crying in the wilderness,' while in the Hebrew the voice crying is a voice full of hope, bidding men prepare the way of return to the homeland through the wilderness and the desert. So a Christian meaning has been read into the old Song of Solomon, a meaning altogether new and out of keeping with the original. 'The break of day' and the 'shadows' have another meaning attached to them, a good meaning, perhaps, but not that of the Song.

BUCHANAN BLAKE.

Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

The Archbishop of York on 'Peace.'

We would draw attention to the important pamphlet which the Archbishop of York has published under the auspices of the League of Nations (S.C.M.; 6d.), and urge that it be widely circulated. The title is *Christ and the Way to Peace*.

In the pamphlet he is addressing himself to two groups of people both of whom believe themselves to have found in the same allegiance the guiding principle of which the world stands in need. The one group consists of those who accept the full doctrine of the Christian Church; the other group starts from considerations of moral value and obligation, and reaches the conviction that in the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth there is offered an expression of the ethical truth which can

save the world. When these two groups, then, are faced with the many bewildering problems demanding solution to-day, what are their obligations?

The first necessity, Dr. Temple says, is for 'study, realistic thought, and vigilance.' He gives an illustration of a field where we have failed in this and which has led to the betrayal of 'a definite trust on behalf of the Assyrian Christians in Iraq.' 'The Archbishop of Canterbury has been untiring in his personal efforts in this cause, but the Christian opinion of the country has remained dormant, and our influence on the side of righteousness and of peace has been greatly damaged by what has appeared to be a breach of promise.'

The result of study, the Archbishop clearly realizes, will not necessarily result in united action

by Christians apart from their union in study. 'It will, however, result in a different attitude towards each other on the part of those who differ in policy. For they will know that they differ only with regard to the most effective application of principles which all agree to uphold.'

In an important paragraph dealing with the Christian's attitude to the State, Dr. Temple says, 'the Christian owes loyalty to his State, but it is not an absolute loyalty; it may be his positive duty to disobey the State, as the instance of the Christian martyrs is alone sufficient to prove.' And dealing specifically with the claim of the Totalitarian State, whether Communist or Fascist, he says, 'If ever the claim of the State conflicts with obedience to God, the State must be defied; and in the last resort it is more completely the function of the State to serve its citizens than it is their function to serve the State, for they have an eternal destiny and the State has not.'

Another principle is that it is of the essence of the Christian Church to be supra-national, for God is the Father of all men and the King of all Nations.

How, then, can these principles be applied? Here Dr. Temple realizes that differences may arise between Christians equally loyal. 'There are some Christians who hold that loyalty to Christ forbids all participation in fighting. We respect that view, but we do not share it.' In time of war when the international order has collapsed, the citizen has to judge what will best effect its reconstitution on a sure foundation. In time of peace he is called upon to promote that fellowship among the nations which may enable them to live together as members in the family of God. The great difficulty is that groupings of men are animated by a measure of corporate egoism more intense than that which animates their component members as individuals. When the nations are truly Christian it may be expected that they will be free from corporate egoism, but to-day the problem is to find the way in which this may be subordinated to justice, peace, and goodwill.

Dr. Temple suggests a way to this Christian end. First, he says it seems to be necessary that the nations should abandon their claims to judge their own cause. And secondly, the chief causes of fear should be removed. Arbitration would of course help here, but another requisite is the ending of all competition in armaments. The further steps which he urges are the strengthening and developing of the machinery which provides the civilized world with a central, co-ordinating organization. He finds that the organization of the community on

the basis of law requires the acceptance of two fundamental principles. The first is the point already made that every nation should abandon its claim to be judge in its own cause. The second principle is that the defence of the individual nation should be undertaken by the community. When once this principle is established he believes that the attack will probably never take place at all.

And all this he holds is strictly congruous with the divine method as Christians have been taught to understand it. 'It is no accident that the Law precedes the Gospel . . . It is to characters already disciplined by Law and its sanctions that the Gospel of love can make its appeal, carrying them on to stages of spiritual attainment to which no law or sanction could ever raise them.'

The Man with the Measuring-rod.

Miss Cable wrote of John Stuart Holden, 'He was to me the man with the measuring-rod. He never spread a bed of roses for sleepy saints to lie on, and allowed no brimming orthodoxy to pass muster for rightness, purity, and honesty in the sight of all men. I have never left his church on a Sunday morning without a twinge of conscience that I came so far short of the pattern he upheld.'

Stuart Holden was a fearless preacher of the truth, and his master passion was to bring men to Christ. In the vestry of St. Paul's, Portman Square, he had a neatly framed couplet hung:

I'll preach as though I ne'er should preach again,
And as a dying man to dying men.

Fifteen representative sermons have been chosen and published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. Mr. Holden's friend, Mr. Marshall Broomhall, has written a short memoir for this volume—*John Stuart Holden: A Book of Remembrance* (5s. net). It is finely done, showing us the man with the gracious personality that we remember—sought after both as a preacher and a pastor. It is well to recall that in the midst of his popularity he suffered very much from harsh judgment, for he was criticised both by the liberal school and by the conservative, by the first for being too narrow, and by the latter for being too broad. Though he was much hurt he never showed resentment, and, speaking of it himself, said, 'The Lord saw I needed the discipline.'

Suffering.

'I recollect some years ago standing on the Leas at Folkestone, on one of the brightest and most sunny days I ever remember, and looking across

the Channel, endeavouring to see something definite in the very dim outline of the coast of France. I was just aware that there was land over there, but that was all. The following day was cold and damp and raw. The air was surcharged with moisture and I walked on the Leas again, and I saw France as plainly as though it had only been five hundred yards away. It was when the air was heavy, when the storm, indeed, was ready to break, that the land which was far off became clear and distinct to unaided vision. And so it is in the tests of life to every one of us. We are seeing "also the Lord" through a mist of tears, as we could never have seen Him in a blaze of sunshine.¹

Be just, fear not.

Mr. Reuben Lincoln, who is now a Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature of England, and was formerly Rabbi of the Star of Israel Congregation, Hoboken, New Jersey, has published a volume of short addresses, a selection from those that he delivered during his ministry—*Outspoken Addresses* (Edward Goldston; 5s. net). One of the addresses is to Barmitzvah Lads. 'The favourite motto,' he says, 'when we were at school ran: "Be just, fear not," and I interpret it, "Be a true, honest, noble-hearted Jew, then what can be your fear in facing the world?"' And to press the lesson home he tells the following story: 'Amongst the great men who have helped to build up the might of the United States Henry Clay stands pre-eminent. He played a large figure in politics, but it is not the work that he did that I want you to remember, but rather the spirit that moved him. He was once arranging for a political campaign, and his friend was trying to dissuade him from doing something upon which he had set his heart. "If you do that," said the friend, "then I tell you candidly, you will never have a chance of being President of the United States." "But," said Clay, "is it right?" "Oh yes, it's right," came the answer. "Very well, then," said Clay, "I'd rather be right than become President."'

Some Better Thing.

'I recall the story behind the harbour-making at Haifa. Granite was necessary for good results, but who could afford to bring it from Norway or Britain to Northern Palestine? Some Americans were prospecting for oil in the Holy Land. They were on Carmel, on the hillsides overlooking Haifa Bay. The more they drilled the less they got for

their pains—just broken implements and disappointments. They were boring on granite. They had found not oil but the one thing needed on that very spot, untold masses of granite, ideal for harbour construction, in the place where it was most needed, ready to hand for the engineers.'²

Pacifism.

Those who have been on Tower Hill with Mr. Donald Soper and have watched him holding his crowd there, and, even more, the great number who listened to him broadcasting during the autumn of last year and the spring of this one, will be glad to have in permanent form the record of his talks. Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published these at 1s. (paper covers), and the title is *Question Time on Tower Hill*. Here is how Mr. Soper dealt with two questions which were put to him as to the attitude of Jesus to pacifism as revealed in the Gospels.

'One correspondent writes: "How do you reconcile the use of force by Christ, when He drove the moneylenders from the Temple, with your beliefs as stated in your talk?" First of all, a small correction. They were money-changers, not money-lenders. This, of course, makes no difference to the real problem. There are three records of this incident, one in Matthew, one in Mark, and one in John. It is from John's record that, in my experience, the evidence is usually taken. Most people, I suppose, would say, if they were asked what happened, that Jesus made a scourge of cords and whipped the money-changers out of the Temple. This is exactly what did not happen. The record definitely states that Jesus used a scourge of cords to drive out the sheep and the oxen, a natural and necessary way of casting them out. There is no evidence that Jesus laid hands on any persons. John says that He poured out the changers' money and overthrew their tables, and to those that sold the doves He said: "Take these things hence." Matthew and Mark content themselves with a shorter record. They state that the money-changers and those who defiled the Temple were cast out. It is unthinkable that money-changers could have been thrashed out of the Temple by a scourge of cords. They were driven out by the moral indignation of One who shamed them by His flaming zeal for righteousness. All these records are a comment not on the physical strength of Jesus, but on the moral and spiritual energy which flowed through Him. It was in the power of God that He healed sickness and cast out evil.

¹ John Stuart Holden: *A Book of Remembrance*, 22.

² R. Lincoln, *Outspoken Addresses*, 186.

'The other question relates to the admittedly difficult passage in which Jesus seems to advocate violence, when, in speaking to His disciples, He says: "He that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip; and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one." The passage from which these words are taken is Luke xxii. 35-38, and must be read as a whole. I would suggest that manifestly it is a part of a longer conversation, most of which is left unrecorded. I cannot but believe that a dispassionate reading of the passage itself would reveal the very opposite interpretation from the one which appears at first sight. Jesus is facing the cross. He is facing it in loneliness. Despite all that He has been able to do for His disciples, they do not believe that the way of non-violence will be effectual. They still cling to the belief in a Messiah who will rally the Jews to fight the Roman "imperium." In the verses immediately preceding this passage Jesus tells Peter, who protests that he is ready to go with Him both to prison and to death: "I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day until thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest Me." Then Jesus goes on to plead with them all: "When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing." Cannot we with reverence imagine how the conversation proceeded, and the impasse it reached. Despite the fact of past successes, when they actually obeyed Jesus, those disciples remained obdurate in the belief that now at this time of crisis, nothing but the way of the sword would bring victory. "Very well," says Jesus, "if you are determined on such a course, then be logical and make your warlike preparations." They say: "Lord, behold, here are two swords." Two swords to fight the legions of Rome. "It is enough," says the Master. "Cannot you see how futile is the way you want to take?" And He goes with them to the Garden of Gethsemane. As I re-read this 22nd chapter of St. Luke, it is not Jesus who seems to waver in His rejection of the sword. It is we, His disciples, who, by our hesitancy and unbelief, make His agony the more profound. We, instead of facing the cross with Him, sleep while He prays and deny Him when He needs us most.'

Keswick.

In the beginning of July this year the Keswick Convention celebrated their diamond jubilee. On the Sunday morning, Canon J. Battersby Harford preached in St. John's Church, Keswick, and reminded his hearers that in the 'seventies of the

last century God 'spoke a special message to a little group of men whose hearts He had touched, and whose ears He had opened. The then vicar of this parish in August, 1874, was called of God to attend meetings which were to be held at Oxford for the promotion of scriptural holiness. There God met him and spoke to him, and in the year before his death he bore this testimony in the public assembly at Oxford: "I got a revelation of Christ to my soul so extraordinary, glorious and precious, that from that day it illuminated my life. I found He was all I wanted. I shall never forget it, the day and hour are present with me, how it humbled me and yet what peace it brought!"' The vicar was his father—Canon T. D. Harford Battersby—and it was he who, the following summer, held the first Keswick Convention. For sixty years it has met with only one break in one of the War years. The full story has been written by Mr. Walter B. Sloan—*These Sixty Years*—and published by Messrs. Pickering & Inglis (2s. 6d. net). It is by no means an easy thing to make a record of sixty Conventions interesting, but Mr. Sloan has succeeded, and the volume not only traces the development of the movement but pays a tribute to its leaders, including a touching one to Dr. Stuart Holden, who died just three weeks after the one held in 1934.

Mr. Sloan remembers many small details of the various Conventions, and so his account gains in vividness. In the opening address of the 1907 Convention, for example, he says that 'reference was made to the "awful danger of the atrophy of our sense of spiritual hearing," and the Speaker told of a watchman at the Falls of Niagara, with whom some one condoled at his having constantly to endure the deafening noise, and the significant answer was, "Bless you, sir, I never hear it."' In that year, too, he remembers that Canon Battersby Harford told that when his father lay dying he asked him to read the thirty-fourth Psalm, with its wonderful note of testimony and dependence, and when it had been read he said, 'That is my experience.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.